

Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges

VOLUME XXIV

NOVEMBER, 1938

NUMBER 3

Edited by

GUY E. SNAVELY

Executive Director of the Association

HELENE K. MOSIER

Editorial Assistant

Published by the

Association of American Colleges

N. Queen St. and McGovern Ave., Lancaster, Pa.

Editorial Offices

19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

March, May, November, December

Annual Subscription, \$3.00

Entered as second class matter, March 15, 1926, at the post office at
Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section
1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized May 13, 1922.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1938-39

President: John L. Seaton, President of Albion College.

Vice-President: Meta Glass, President of Sweet Briar College.

Treasurer: LeRoy E. Kimball, Comptroller of New York University.

Executive Director: Guy E. Snavely.

—*Executive Director Emeritus:* Robert L. Kelly, Claremont, California.

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS: Remsen D. Bird, President of Occidental College; Charles E. Diehl, President of Southwestern; Mildred H. McAfee, President of Wellesley College; Edward V. Stanford, President of Villanova College.

STANDING COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE: President Henry M. Wriston, Brown University, *Chairman*; Chancellor S. P. Capen, The University of Buffalo; President William C. Dennis, Earlham College; President Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Mount Mary College; President Meta Glass, Sweet Briar College; President E. J. Jaqua, Scripps College; President R. A. Kent, University of Louisville; President James L. McConaughy, Wesleyan University; President W. P. Tolley, Allegheny College; Dean Carl A. Wittke, Oberlin College.

COMMISSION ON COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE AND COLLEGE INSTRUCTION IN FINE ARTS: R. H. Fitzgerald, Provost of University of Pittsburgh, *Chairman*; Dean Roy J. Deferrari, The Catholic University of America; President E. M. Gwathmey, Converse College; President F. P. Keppel, The Carnegie Corporation; President B. H. Kroeze, Jamestown College; J. Fredrick Larson, Dartmouth College; Professor Arthur Pope, Harvard University.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION: President Harry M. Gage, Coe College, *Chairman*; President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College; Dean Margaret T. Corwin, New Jersey College for Women; President C. K. Edmunds, Pomona College; President Fred Engelhardt, University of New Hampshire; President Fred G. Holloway, Western Maryland College; President L. H. Hubbard, Texas State College for Women; President W. L. Lingle, Davidson College; President P. C. Nash, University of Toledo.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON FRATERNITIES: President Dixon Ryan Fox, Union College, *Chairman*; President Thomas N. Barrows, Lawrence College; Comptroller LeRoy E. Kimball, New York University; President Alexander Ruthven, University of Michigan; President Henry M. Wriston, Brown University.

COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES: President W. E. Weld, Wells College, *Chairman*; President Charles A. Anderson, Tusculum College; Controller J. C. Christensen, University of Michigan; Dean Francis L. Meade, Niagara University; Dean Paul H. Musser, University of Pennsylvania.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS: The President, *ex officio*, the Vice-President, *ex officio*, The Executive Director, *ex officio*.

REPRESENTATIVES ON AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION: President Gilbert W. Mead, Washington College (two years), President Frank P. Graham, University of North Carolina (one year), Chancellor S. P. Capen, The University of Buffalo (three years).

REPRESENTATIVE ON COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION: Guy E. Snively.

THE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

The BULLETIN is published four times a year—in March, May, November and December. Its emphasis is on description and exposition, not primarily on criticism or controversy. The March issue regularly carries the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association. Leaders in the college world contribute to every issue.

Annual Subscription Rates: Regular, \$3.00; to members of Association colleges special rates are offered: individual subscriptions, \$1.00; ten or more club subscriptions, mailed in one package for distribution at the college, 50 cents each. Address the Association of American Colleges, 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Editorial Notes	285
The College President, <i>James L. McConaughy</i>	290
First Aid for University Trustees, <i>Herman G. James</i>	304
What Makes a Good Trustee, <i>Kenneth I. Brown</i>	314
Ten Commandments of a College President, <i>William Henry McMaster</i>	315
One-Type College Doomed, <i>Walter B. Pitkin</i>	316
The College and Culture, <i>Wm. H. Cowley</i>	320
Teacher Training <i>versus</i> Teacher Education, <i>Alan Valentine</i>	327
Science, Technology, Economics and Progress, <i>Harold G. Moulton</i>	339
Reflection and the Active Life, <i>Gordon Keith Chalmers</i>	351
Possibilities for Improving Alumni Relations, <i>J. L. Morrill</i>	363
The Acceptance of Funds Subject to Annuity, <i>A. A. Wellock</i>	370
Cooperation for a University Theatre, <i>Nadine Miles</i>	373
Tenure in New York City Colleges, <i>Ordway Tead</i>	376
By-Laws on Organization and Tenure of the Instructional Staffs of the New York City Colleges	379
Among the Colleges	392
New College Presidents	396
Additions to the Office Library	398

EDITORIAL NOTES

THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION WILL BE HELD AT THE BROWN HOTEL, LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY, JANUARY 12-13, 1939.

The speakers at the Annual Meeting will direct their discussions toward the general topic, "The Cultural Obligations of the College Faculty." It is expected that one of the chief addresses will be delivered by a prominent Englishman. Some of the commissions may have some very interesting reports, notably the Commission on Insurance and Annuities. Details of the program will be published in the December BULLETIN.

REGIONAL CONFERENCES

THREE regional conferences have been scheduled for this fall—with the University of Richmond, Richmond, Virginia, October 21-22; with Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, November 7-8; and with Hendrix College, Conway, Arkansas, November 10-12.

A PLACEMENT COMMITTEE for German and Austrian Musicians has been formed under the auspices of the National Coordinating Committee for Aid to Refugees and Emigrants coming from Germany, with Professor Joseph P. Chamberlain of Columbia University as chairman. It is entirely philanthropic and non-sectarian. It aims to select the most able musicians and recommend them for opportunities for which they are especially fitted. There are a number of musicians among them whose training and background make them particularly suitable for various types of positions in the music departments of American universities. The Committee will welcome any inquiries regarding these musicians, and will be glad to give detailed information as to their qualifications, both professional and personal. Inquiries may be addressed to the Committee at 165 West Forty-sixth Street, New York City.

PHILANTHROPIC FOUNDATIONS AND HIGHER EDUCATION from the pen of Ernest Victor Hollis, published in September by the Columbia University Press, is of great interest to college administrators. Dr. Hollis has made a very careful and in-

tensive study of the work of a hundred of the larger foundations. He has analyzed the foundation as a social institution, as well as outlined in some detail the activities of foundations in the realm of higher education. He has discussed foundation policies, noting their evolution through three definite stages—the one previous to the World War, one for the decade immediately thereafter, and the present trend. Attention is called to the by-products of the work of the foundations such as stimulating higher standards among the colleges and the additional contribution of large sums to higher education. Tables are given to show the geographical and institutional distribution of the larger grants. There is elaboration also of foundation activities for the welfare of students and faculty, for stimulus to professional education, and the more recent interest in activities that are of a more general nature. Dr. Hollis is a member of the faculty of the College of the City of New York. He is a native Mississippian. He has had experience as professor in a teachers' college in Kentucky and as president of a teachers' college in Georgia.

THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION of New York City has taken very significant action with regard to the organization and tenure of the instructional staff of the colleges of New York City—Brooklyn College, College of the City of New York, Hunter College, and Queens College. The two by-laws adopted the past summer with regard to these important matters are published in this issue of the *BULLETIN*. College trustees, presidents, deans, and faculty members will have keen personal interest in the results attendant upon the operation of this decidedly new type of internal college administration. They will be interested also in reading the statement concerning the matter made by Chairman Ordway Tead.

QUESTIONNAIRES

LETTERS indicating that college officials are still being asked to fill in lengthy questionnaires have come to the office. For the information of our new member colleges and of persons contemplating the use of questionnaires, we are reprinting a plan suggested by the Executive Committee in 1931, by means of which it is hoped college officials will be relieved of requests to fill in questionnaires of little value.

The Plan

The suggestion is made for your consideration, that the colleges which desire to cooperate in this matter may refer questionnaires of doubtful value to the Association of American Colleges.

This would mean, after this practice became established, that persons desiring to circulate questionnaires would, in the first instance, send a copy to this office. This office would then inquire into the authenticity of the questionnaire itself, whether it had the indorsement of a responsible institution or graduate school; whether, in case the questionnaire is properly approved, part or all of the data might not be furnished from the very extensive factual resources at our command in this office; and finally, whether the author or authors of the questionnaire are willing to pay to this office or to the colleges approached, or to both if it were necessary to divide responsibility, the necessary cost of making an adequate reply to the questionnaire.

After making these inquiries this office would disapprove the questionnaire, or approve it with modifications, or approve it without modifications. In either of the two latter cases the questionnaire when issued would bear a statement regarding its approval.

Colleges receiving questionnaires so approved would presumably fill them out with a considerable measure of confidence in their value. Questionnaires without such approval could with entire propriety be disregarded—perhaps with notice to the sender that the questionnaire was being disregarded because of the fact that it did not have the approval of this Association.

The practice pending the establishment of the plan, would differ from the foregoing only in that many questionnaires, as at present, would be sent directly to the colleges without submission to this office. The procedure on the part of the colleges during this period with questionnaires concerning which they were in doubt would be exactly as outlined above—except that the director of the Association would presumably ask certain colleges to supply him with copies of questionnaires received and disregarded. The issuer, failing to get the questionnaires filled out, would then presumably apply to this office for approval; and the procedure as above outlined would then go forward.

A COLLEGE PRESIDENT with the courage of his convictions is James L. McConaughy of Wesleyan University, who has

accepted nomination by the Republican Party for the position of Lieutenant Governor of Connecticut. He is practicing the preachments he heard at our last annual meeting when the main theme of discussion was college interest in public affairs. He was president of the Association during the year, 1937-38.

A RECENT incident experienced by a president of one of our member colleges indicates that there is a new kind of impostor abroad. An individual, representing himself as Director of the National Music League (which closed its office on June 30, 1938), proposed plans for music scholarships. Toward the conclusion of the interview, the impostor presented a plausible request for recommendation to a bank so that a sizable check was cashed. The check turned out to be bogus, and the individual could not be reached at the New York address he gave. The man in question has a criminal record and has victimized more than one institution. Member institutions should be on guard for such a person and others with similar stories.

A LETTER of greeting and best wishes has gone to each new president of member institutions. We feel an especial interest in the new presidents of Millsaps College in Mississippi and Huntingdon College in Alabama. New presidents Smith and Searcy were most cooperative and efficient as our colleagues on the Birmingham-Southern College faculty. We are glad to know that they both report fine increases in enrolment since they have taken over their duties at the beginning of the present college year.

The office feels keen interest and sympathy also in the present presidency of the University of Chattanooga. Archie M. Palmer, who assumed his duties there the past summer, was for five years associate secretary of the Association. He has the best wishes of all his friends in the Association as he undertakes his new responsibilities.

DR. ROBERT E. BLACKWELL

A SOUTHERN gentleman of the old school passed away on July 7, 1938. The cavalier and genial scholar, Dr. Robert E. Blackwell, died in the Emory University Hospital in Atlanta, Georgia, after a long illness with which he was afflicted at the conclusion of

the last General Conference of the Southern Methodist Church, held in Birmingham the first week in May.

It was the writer's high privilege and great pleasure to sit with him as a fellow delegate in this conference and to enjoy for the last time his genial wit and inspiring friendship.

Dr. Blackwell presided over the destinies of Randolph-Macon College at Ashland, Virginia, the past thirty-eight years. His absence will be greatly felt in the national, regional and state councils of the liberal arts colleges.

NOTE:—We failed to indicate in the May 1938 BULLETIN that Dr. B. Lamar Johnson's article, "General Education Changes the College," was previously published in the *Journal of Higher Education* for January, 1938.

THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT*

JAMES L. MCCONAUGHY

PRESIDENT, WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

I

THERE are presidents for everything, from the nation down. But "Prexy" is peculiarly the title of a college administrator. It suggests emotion, often affection. "Prexy" Roosevelt of the U.S.A.—it does not quite click—nor "Prexy" Sloan of General Motors; but Prexy Smith of Oshkosh College does. Actually, nearly all college executives are "Presidents," due largely to the fact that the founders of Harvard included many graduates of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and that college calls its head president—although dean, warden, and principal are almost as frequently used as titles in Cambridge and Oxford colleges. Other American colleges, as they were established, followed the example of Harvard. A few have the title of chancellor (Buffalo, Louisville, Nebraska, New York University, Vanderbilt); these institutions were founded during a period when European influence was strong, and the customary title there was adopted. Union College has both a president and a chancellor; the latter is an honorary position, filled annually by a person holding public office, whose main duty is to speak at commencement. At McGill the chairman of the board of trustees is chancellor and the chief educational officer is principal. Pennsylvania has a provost. Only one university ever tried to do without a titular head; Virginia, under Jefferson's democratic ideals, had a leader chosen from and by the faculty for a determined period of years, and then chose his successor in the same way. This plan of decentralized leadership did not seem to work, and in 1889 Alderman was elected as the first president. This Jeffersonian scheme has been in use at Oxford and Cambridge for centuries; the vice-chancellor (the chancellorship is honorary) is chosen in rotation for a two or three year term from the heads of the constituent colleges of the university. Actually England and Europe have no academic officials who correspond to American college presidents.

* Reprinted from *The Educational Forum*, May, 1938.

In this day of vigorous vocational advice, the college presidency is one job which has not been analyzed at all. If you want to become a president, there are no courses to take in preparation, no professional or vocational help you can secure. You might read a few books, such as those of Thwing (*Western Reserve*), but the real features of this job you can learn only by experience. In thirty years, I have known of only one undergraduate who admitted he would like to become a president; and he changed his mind and entered business. Being a professor or a dean is a help; training as a public speaker is very much worth while. As for the rest—it seems to depend on chance.

Yesterday almost all college presidents were ministers. Colleges were more or less under denominational control; it was thought that ministerially trained presidents would be good influences upon immature youth. Educational policies were decided largely by the professors; few such presidents were really educators. Today only those colleges with strong church ties look to the ministry when choosing a president. In New England, once the stronghold of divines as presidents, apart from the Catholic institutions the only presidencies now held by ministers are at Bates, Boston, Middlebury, Trinity, and Wheaton. The new presidents of Brown and Muhlenberg are the first non-clerics in their history; Wesleyan's president is the first without a D.D.

A few years ago the makers of presidents seemed particularly impressed with the training of a professorship of education—Coffman (Minnesota), Foster (Reed), Jessup (Iowa), McConaughy (Wesleyan), Payne (Peabody). Fewer professors of education have been chosen in recent years although Englehart of New Hampshire and Klapper, first president of the new Queens University in Brooklyn, were deans of schools of education. Some institutions have had fine leadership from men trained as business executives: Hopkins (who before his business success had been secretary to the president and director of athletics at Dartmouth); Gates (who came to Pennsylvania from a Morgan partnership); King (experienced in Amherst affairs through his long trusteeship); Cousens (president of the Alumni Association at Tufts); Morgan (who rebuilt and in large part

personally refinanced Antioch). Marts (Bucknell) is doing a fine piece of educational leadership while still continuing, part time, to direct his advertising business in New York. Benton has just become vice-president of Chicago, after making a million dollars in business in the sixteen years since he graduated from Yale. California and Michigan have each elected presidents who showed their fitness as the business managers of their respective universities. A college degree is not even a necessity; the career of Williams at Missouri proved that. On the first occasion when a business trained man became president of a noted institution, some academically minded persons were worried. After Hopkins' inaugural at Dartmouth such a president wrote to congratulate him on the "most auspicious occasion." The typist made a slip and the letter read "most suspicious occasion" which, said Hopkins, it really was to the writer!

Men prominent in public life have often seemed good presidential prospects. Dwight Morrow was asked to consider Yale; Newton Baker was urged to come to Johns Hopkins. Bailey went to Vermont from the state secretaryship. The new president at Maryland was a leader in the state's political life. Brown came to New York University from the Federal Commission of Education; Tigert, one of his successors, is now at the University of Florida. Wilbur went to the President's Cabinet from Leland Stanford and returned to the presidency. Jardine (Wichita) had been a cabinet member and Minister to Egypt.

Eddy (Hobart) and Ham (Mount Holyoke) secured training for the vicissitudes of the college presidency by serving actively as marines in the World War.

Today most presidencies are filled by deans or professors. From the deanship came Baxter, Williams (master of a Harvard College); Gilmore, Iowa; Hutchins, Chicago (dean of Yale's Law School); Middlebush, Missouri; Seymour (provost, which is a superdeanship), Yale; Sills, Bowdoin; Tolley, Allegheny (dean at Brothers College); Willard, Illinois. From professorships: Conant, Harvard; Eddy, Hobart (from Dartmouth); Fox, Union (from Columbia). Angell went to Yale and Day to Cornell from the leadership of an educational Foundation; both had been professors earlier. Unusual professorial training was:

astronomy, Campbell (California); law, Gilmore (Iowa) and Harris (Tulane); medicine, Farrand (Cornell) and Wilbur (Stanford). Examples of out of the ordinary training for a presidency are: aeronautics, Adams (Norwich); athletic director, Davies (Colorado College); city manager, Dykstra (Wisconsin); editor, Britt (Knox), Bryan (William and Mary), and Holt (Rollins); lawyer, Dennis (Earlham); publisher, Brewer (Olivet); radio, Tyson (Muhlenberg).

Presidents do not change from one presidency to another as much as formerly. Chase holds the record now: from North Carolina to Illinois to New York. Here are some "two-timers": Brown (Chattanooga to Drew), Chalmers (Rockford, girls, to Kenyon, a very "he-man" college), Elliott (Montana to Purdue), Farrand (Colorado to Cornell), Ganfield (Centre to Carroll), Hetzel (New Hampshire to Penn State), Lewis (George Washington to Lafayette), Marvin (Arizona to George Washington), McConaughy (Knox to Wesleyan), McVey (North Dakota to Kentucky), Mendenhall (Friends to Whittier), Wriston (Lawrence to Brown). There is a decided tendency today to pick a president who is on the ground; this was done by California, Harvard, Illinois, Iowa, Lawrence, Michigan, North Carolina, Princeton, Syracuse, Tulane, Virginia, and Yale. Some colleges nearly always choose alumni; Angell is Yale's only exception; Harvard has not gone outside her own product for two centuries. Many recently appointed presidents have had English training: Seymour (Yale) at Cambridge, Aydelotte (Swarthmore) and Valentine (Rochester) at Oxford. Eight former Rhodes scholars are presidents. The middle western institutions are turning to eastern men much less than they used to when hunting presidents.

In earlier years, Yale trained many presidents to be; now we have B.A.'s from every college imaginable. A recent study of seventy new presidents disclosed that less than a third had the Ph.D. degree (seventeen had no academic degree beyond the B.A.); only seventeen were members of Phi Beta Kappa (and ten wore their keys only as "honorary members"); thirty-one were in *Who's Who* when elected; seventeen were alumni of the colleges to which they were elected as president; in age they varied from twenty-nine to sixty-six; forty-six was the average age, half being between forty and fifty when chosen.

II

If there is no general rule for the previous training of a president, there certainly is none for the method by which he is selected. Usually a small committee of trustees is appointed to make the choice; sometimes—and this would almost always be wise—older faculty men are added to the committee; if not, the faculty may be individually consulted. When the decision is made, the committee faces a difficult problem in getting the formal vote from the board and making the announcement promptly. It is very hard to keep a committee's choice secret; if the successful candidate is at another institution, he must present his resignation. Newspaper publicity, including pictures and radio announcements, must be prepared before the whole board meets. The election of Ham at Mount Holyoke presented such difficulties—as well as others! When the board met it was told of the committee's selection and the arrangements which had been made for publicity, including a radio announcement. Although many trustees had never met Professor Ham, and although some wished to choose a woman, the committee had to ask for an election at the same meeting at which it reported. Some day, someone may devise a better, less disturbing method of electing and announcing a new president; we need it.

Academic circles enjoy "behind the scenes" stories of what caused certain choices. For example, Conant was first considered seriously by the Harvard trustees when he, on invitation, appeared before the committee and, with clear analysis of the type of man needed at Harvard, urged the candidacy of one of his closest friends. At Yale the committee investigated all other possibilities and by comparing them with their Provost agreed that Seymour was the man. No one at Princeton thought of Dodds when Hibben resigned; during the months of search Dodds had shown his capabilities in an intricate state survey in New Jersey; the board, which included men interested in New Jersey reorganization, finally decided that he was the wisest choice for Princeton.

Certain men are often consulted when presidents are being sought, such as Keppel of the Carnegie Corporation and Butler of Columbia. Twenty years ago, when Rockefeller money was

doing so much for American colleges, one could almost always find some presidents and some trustees—after money and advice—waiting outside of Butterick's office at the General Education Board.

In times of difficulty for a president his wife often suffers more than he does. When our one-time supporters attack us, and critical letters arrive, and trustees and faculty thwart our plans, we usually can bear it with a smile, but our wives are cut to the quick. When Northwestern lost a boy, probably in an initiation prank, the jury which investigated insisted on calling the president's wife to the stand. Many a wife, by her quiet poise and serenity, has "saved" her husband in a time of crisis.

Presidential salaries are usually not large. A house and sometimes a car, occasionally other perquisites, are included. Probably not over half the presidents of the country have any pension expectancy. In a recent study of thirty-five denominational colleges, it was found that presidents' salaries ranged from \$10,000 to under \$4,000; the median was \$6,000. Individual salaries are seldom made public; it is generally supposed that Columbia pays \$30,000 plus perquisites, with Yale, Harvard, Princeton, Chicago, the College of the City of New York, and New York University paying slightly less. Probably not over twenty presidents in all the country get more than \$15,000 plus free house rent. The Office of Education of the Department of the Interior published some presidential salaries for 1934-35 (salary cuts in some institutions have now been restored); the median for state institutions was \$7,438; for privately controlled colleges, \$4,478. In institutions aided by the state, Pittsburgh was the highest, \$31,500 (the highest faculty salary there was given as \$4,500), followed by Brooklyn College \$21,000, California \$18,000, Illinois \$17,500, Pennsylvania State \$15,600, Michigan \$15,400, Minnesota \$14,800, Virginia \$12,750, Louisiana \$12,000, and Iowa \$10,000. The Dakotas were at the bottom of the scale—North Dakota \$3,000 and South Dakota \$3,660. Salaries were given for only a few of the non-state institutions (which usually supply less complete figures to the Office of Education than do those which receive federal funds). Among the highest were Hamilton \$15,000, Skidmore \$14,000, Bowdoin \$12,500, Middlebury, Occidental, Rollins, and Tufts \$12,000 each,

Connecticut College for Women and Western Reserve \$10,000 each, Claremont \$8,500. At the bottom were Adrian \$1,500, Goshen \$1,650, and St. Ambrose \$1,700.

When Texas appointed a football coach at \$15,000 a year, with a ten-year contract, there were some citizens who felt it regrettable that this was nearly twice the president's salary. Accordingly, the Legislature agreed that the salary of the new president, who is now being sought, should be \$17,500; I think they do not, however, propose to offer him a ten-year contract!

The title of the "youngest college president" is one which seems to command public interest. Finley became president of Knox, his Alma Mater, at the age of twenty-nine; this record probably stands for well known institutions. Hutchins was elected at Chicago at thirty. The oldest college president is Blackwell* of Randolph-Macon; he is now eighty-three; he graduated in 1874 from the college he now heads and became a professor two years later; he has been president since 1902. Long presidencies were those of Bryan (Indiana), thirty-five years; Eliot (Harvard), forty years; Faunce (Brown), thirty years; Gilman (Johns Hopkins), twenty-seven years; Hyde (Bowdoin), thirty-two years; Pierce (Kenyon), forty years; Snyder (Wofford), thirty-five years; and Woolley (Mount Holyoke), thirty-seven years. Boatwright has been at Richmond since 1895, Randolph at Charleston since 1897; both are still in office. Presidents still active after twenty-five or more years in their present position include Butler (Columbia), Clippinger (Otterbein), Cowling (Carleton), Denny (Alabama), Evans (Ripon), Few (Duke), Lovett (Rice), McMaster (Mount Union), Neilson (Smith). Among active presidents with terms of over twenty years, one notes Hopkins (Dartmouth), MacCracken (Vassar), Reinhardt (Mills), Sills (Bowdoin), Wilbur (Leland Stanford).

The age of presidential retirement varies greatly. Angell left Yale last June, aged sixty-eight (the faculty rule for retirement there applies also to presidents). Kirkland left Vanderbilt last year after forty-four years of leadership, when he was seventy-eight. Lowell (Harvard) retired at seventy-seven, probably staying on longer than he originally intended in order to com-

* President Blackwell has died since this article was written.

plete the development of the House plan; Hibben (Princeton) was seventy when he resigned. One topic of general presidential gossip is "When will Butler retire?" He alone knows the answer; the administrative machinery at Columbia is in such excellent working order that the University appears to be in first-class shape, although the president is seventy-five and spends much time away from his office. Butler is said to have protested vigorously in private to Hibben, when he resigned "because of age" at seventy. Those "in the know" say that the Columbia president wishes to add from twenty to thirty million dollars to the University's endowment before he leaves; he knows, say they, of wills leaving to Columbia this amount, and wishes still to be president when the donors die and the bequests come in; it is thus an interesting race between the septuagenarian and the still living benefactors.

Long presidencies are fairly frequent in the East, but nationally they are decidedly the exception, not the rule. The average length of presidential service on one campus is just under four years. About fifty new presidents are elected annually; last fall there were sixty-three. Usually, ten per cent "fail," at least in the judgment of the trustees. A few die in harness; three of M.I.T.'s presidents died in service. The test of presidential effectiveness usually comes in the third year. The first year or two are a "honeymoon period" when the new leadership is welcomed; after that you are an old story, your decisions may irritate, your clientele now know you are not the superman they hoped they had chosen.

There are those who maintain that no president is a good judge of the time to retire. His trustees, with whom he has been associated for many years, tend to be largely of his point of view, some perhaps of his choosing, some doubtless older than he. They may be less conscious than the students, faculty, and alumni that new, younger leadership is needed. When Thwing (Western Reserve) retired at sixty-eight (sixteen years before he died), he explained that "it is not given to any man to bridge two generations." When the president discusses his possible retirement with the trustees, they urge his continuance; perhaps they dread the difficult search for a new leader. One aging president, sensing this, told his dean that if ever he felt the time for

presidential retirement had come, "please come and tell me so, frankly." The time arrived, and the dean, with some hesitation, asked the president if he remembered the request. "Surely," said the president, "and if ever in the future you feel I should retire, I want you to say so. Personally, I am sure I was never more fit, never doing my work better."

When presidents retire, what shall they do? A few live on near the campus; unless they are rare personalities, their mere presence may hamper their successors. Some travel, some move to Washington. A few are elected to the board of trustees—almost always an unwise action. (When Warfield, acquiescing to the wishes of the Lafayette trustees, resigned, to the surprise of all he continued his membership on the board for many years.) Automobile driving seems to be a dangerous activity for ex-presidents. Hibben was given a car by grateful alumni upon his retirement from Princeton; quite soon he was involved in an accident, fatal to him and his wife. Lowell, at eighty, had two accidents in one day; his license was taken away. Some of us, I imagine, envy Miss Pendleton of Wellesley, who retired in June, 1936, after a fine career of wise usefulness; she dreaded "doing nothing;" she died quietly and serenely after a few days' illness, a month later.

In the stronger institutions pension provisions usually provide enough to live on simply. In earlier days these pensions came from the Carnegie Foundation, without any contribution during service from the pensioner. Ex-presidents and emeritus professors showed such longevity—quite contrary to the expectancy of insurance experts—that such a plan had to be abandoned a few years ago. Those who were on the Carnegie list of approved institutions twenty years ago have pension expectancies of \$1,500 annually beginning at seventy; a widow has half this amount. Usually, there are also annuity policies, generally written by the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association (formed by the Carnegie Corporation, which has financed all administration costs); the college and the individual contribute annually, usually five per cent, to the purchase of an annuity. One college president (Eaton of Beloit) had retired just before Mr. Carnegie's original pension plan was announced; with amusing but understandable Yankee thrift, he asked to be re-elected,

served a short second period, and retired, this time to enjoy for many years a comfortable pension.

If the president is vigorous, and the pension is small, very occasionally a retired president may seek a position in some other field. Angell joined a radio corporation at a salary probably no less than he had received from Yale; he told his friends that six step-children to educate made another job a necessity. Occasionally, a president may retire to a professorship. Before the days of pensions this was the normal method of caring for an ex-president; oftentimes the teaching by a very aged man was most inferior; in some cases, this classroom contact with a wise old gentleman was inspiring. At one time Carleton had on its faculty five professors who had been presidents.

Presidents differ in their treatment of students. Eliot said he was too busy to greet every Harvard boy he passed in the Yard, but countless men remember with deep gratitude his call when they were ill in the Infirmary and his solicitude for their recovery. Everyone who saw Bryan preside at commencement at Ohio University was impressed with the word of individualized personal greeting he gave to each graduate as he handed out the diploma. Some of us teach: at Bowdoin, Sills gives a largely elected course in literature; nearly every senior for decades took Hyde's course in ethics, which under his teaching magic touched almost every problem the college and its students faced. Baxter (Williams) announces that he plans to teach next semester. My course, held weekly in the "playroom" in my home, with complete informality prevailing, is one of the most pleasant parts of my job.

III

The American college has many very able leaders today. A tentative list of the most outstanding might include Aydelotte (Swarthmore), Coffman (Minnesota), Conant (Harvard), Cowling (Carleton), Glass (Sweet Briar), Hopkins (Dartmouth), Hutchins (Chicago), Neilson (Smith), Reinhardt (Mills), Scott (Northwestern), Wilkins (Oberlin). Among the recently retired: Angell (Yale), Blaisdell (Claremont), Farrand (Cornell), Jessup (Iowa), King (Oberlin), Kirkland (Vanderbilt), Lowell (Harvard), Thompson (Ohio), Woolley (Mount Holyoke).

From somewhat earlier days: Alderman (Virginia), Angell (Michigan), Eliot (Harvard), Falconer (Toronto), Gilman (Johns Hopkins), Graham (North Carolina), Harper (Chicago), Hyde (Bowdoin), James (Illinois), MacLaurin (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), Northup (Minnesota), Thwing (Western Reserve), Tucker (Dartmouth), Van Hise (Wisconsin), Patton (Princeton).

Butler deserves a special classification; he has become almost a legendary figure. Today he is Columbia. His prominence in national and international affairs is comparable only to that of Eliot. Perhaps there are some who feel that his frequent pronouncements reflect the ideas and ideals of an older generation. His influence in American educational affairs is probably less than it was two decades ago. Although Butler seems to have less concern with purely collegiate problems today, and fewer ties with other institutions than he did at fifty (in this he differs from Eliot in his later years), he is one of our greatest educators and public men. His physical vigor is amazing; on a recent visit at a New England campus to address alumni and undergraduates, he wore out the much younger president with his desire to inspect all parts of the campus and speak at any gathering.

There would be debate among presidents about the inclusion of Woodrow Wilson's name in a list of "great college presidents," just as there is vigorous, sometimes partisan, disagreement about his place among our national presidents. His ideas at Princeton were far in advance of his times; the preceptorial plan which he established has been the most important educational aspect of the institution ever since. But he failed at Princeton as, to some extent, he failed at Washington—and for the same reason: his inability to get along with others. Responsibility seemed to make him arrogant, unbending; his quarrel with Dean West over the location of the Graduate College is a sad page in the history of higher education in America. He refused to consider alumni opposition to his plan for abolishing the Clubs, still existent and probably of little educational value to Princeton. A willingness to make haste more slowly, by winning—not driving—his constituency, would have made his career as a college president very different. Perhaps he was a genius,

a first grade mind; unfortunately such persons are usually intolerant of objections and hesitations by lesser folk. Perhaps no such person can ever be a successful leader of a college campus made up of average, often hesitant people—or of a democracy.

Wilson and Eliot were national figures; Butler is today. Other presidents have occupied positions of public importance. Brumbaugh (Juniata) was Governor of Pennsylvania; Ex-Senator Fess of Ohio came from the presidency of Antioch; Sills (Bowdoin) ran for the Senate when a Maine Democrat had no chance; Hyde (Bowdoin) was offered an interim appointment to the Senate. Plumley (Norwich) is Vermont's only Representative. Hutchins (Chicago) is supposed to have been offered various New Deal positions of leadership. Schurman (Cornell) was Ambassador to Germany. Gilmore (Iowa) served as vice-governor and acting governor-general of the Philippines. Douglas, formerly director of the budget, has just become principal of McGill, of which his grandfather was a trustee. Hopkins (Dartmouth) is powerful in New Hampshire politics; he is probably the State's "first citizen."

Among the most picturesque of presidents are Park (Wheaton) full of Irish wit; Blackwell (Randolph-Macon), a charming southern gentleman "of the old school"; Holt (Rollins) who seems quite sure of the solutions to all collegiate problems; Valentine (Rochester) the "golden-haired boy" of the profession with the income from an endowment of fifty millions—largely Eastman's—to spend; Cutten (Colgate), short-haired, vigorous, sometimes dominating; Sister Antonia (St. Catherine's, Minnesota) who knows as much as any man about "running" a college; Aydelotte (Swarthmore), steeped in Oxford customs, outstanding exponent of Honors work; Ogilby (Trinity) who smokes his pipe everywhere except when conducting a service—including marriages of his graduates—in his superb new chapel, or when playing the chimes in its tower; Miss Glass (Sweet Briar) who has ability comparable to that of her distinguished Senator brother and a southern charm which makes her one of the most popular of the "brethren"; Robinson (College of the City of New York), etcher, sculptor, and musician, as well as able executive; MacCracken (Vassar) who has the unique distinction of

having a father and brother who were college executives, the former Chancellor at New York University and the latter President of Lafayette.

Hutchins (Chicago) is probably the most colorful of us all. Intellectually and as a speaker he ranks at the top. He disturbed many of his faculty by opposing life tenure for professors, but he made before the Illinois legislature the most effective defense of academic freedom in a decade. He has appointed professors whom the faculty refused to welcome. His revision of the Chicago curriculum was modern in the extreme; now he is advocating a return to the "trivium" of the Middle Ages. There are stories afloat of vigorous opposition to him on the part of half of his faculty. If he leaves Chicago, the academic world will lose one of its most stimulating personalities.

Few (Duke) deceives one on first meeting. He seems old and very casual in his executive procedure. As one investigates further, clear evidences of unusual power appear. He has taken a small denominational institution and won for it greater gifts than any college has had in decades. He has wisely negotiated with the trustees of the Duke estate (separate from the University's trustees) so that they are completely in sympathy with his plans. He has built a twenty million dollar plant of superb beauty and developed graduate schools—particularly in medicine—in the first rank nationally. With all this growth of Duke, Few has retained the loyalty and affection of the other southern college presidents; since Kirkland's resignation, he is the leading president in that section of the country.

Many able men have failed as college presidents. Pease (Amherst) and Nichols (Dartmouth) both found teaching more congenial. Day (Union) failed because of ill health, resulting from World War wounds. Frank (Wisconsin) never really learned what the job was. Little (Michigan) defied the opinion of a large section of the state. Britt (Knox) lost the support of his Board because of mounting financial problems. Neither Sykes nor Marshall (Connecticut) could win the loyalty of the trustees. At Millikin, in Illinois, the unusual provision of a will, whereby the income from the college's endowment remains under the control of the will's executors, has wrecked more than one hopeful president. (The somewhat similarly controlled Sterling bequest at Yale has not presented such difficulties.)

Men are sometimes appointed presidents to "tide over" between administrations. Olds (Amherst) did this, after the Meiklejohn difficulties, with rare charm. Barbour (Brown), sixty-two when elected, did not, because of the depression, bring in the gifts expected, but he did carry the college on from Faunce's long administration until the break with the Baptist tradition, when Wriston was chosen.

Some states (Georgia, Montana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon) have recently established a super-presidency over all the state-supported higher institutions. This is an impossible position. Graham, at North Carolina, would undoubtedly become a great president; however, he is responsible also for the welfare of the other state colleges and no man can effectively do all this. If he decides to concentrate engineering at the State College at Raleigh, the University at Chapel Hill grows because some of its faculty and students must move. If he removes an unsatisfactory coach at Raleigh, tongues will wag when the University football team defeats State. Like many educational reforms, what "looked fine" on paper proves impossible in practise.

Are there as many able college executives today as in past decades? Probably not. Teaching now attracts many men who previously would have chosen administrative work. The presidency is more complicated, and less revered, than it was. In the State University field we have many able leaders today, but they are not, I fear, the equals of those of yesterday. It was not long ago that these men, all nationally known, were active: Alderman (Virginia), Bryan (Indiana), Burton (Michigan), Farrand (Colorado), E. K. Graham (North Carolina), James (Illinois), Jessup (Iowa), Suzzalo (Washington), Thompson (Ohio), Van Hise (Wisconsin), Vincent (Minnesota), and Wheeler (California). Truly, there were giants in those days.

FIRST AID FOR UNIVERSITY TRUSTEES

HERMAN G. JAMES

PRESIDENT, OHIO UNIVERSITY

ALL in all there are perhaps some 750 institutions of higher education in the United States, though official statistics list several hundred more that claim to fall into that category. Of the 750, moreover, a great many are special institutions of one kind or another—special in that they have either a limited objective or special requirements of a sectarian nature governing trustees or administrative officers. These need not concern us here. A great many others are too insignificant or too precarious to be of lasting importance. For our purposes let us have regard only to the most important third of the total number, for they set the pattern for the rest.

Of these 250 most important institutions of higher education—no matter here about the exact criteria by which they are chosen—certain aspects are arresting. They might comprise roughly a quarter of a million students, perhaps twenty thousand teachers, and an annual expenditure of around a hundred million dollars, not including building operations. A pretty important business, no matter how you look at it.

How is this business run? Almost without exception it is headed by a governing board usually known as "Trustees" or "Regents" or some such title. This board is a group of laymen for whom this particular activity is a side line. The actual conduct of the institution is entrusted to an officer selected by them, variously designated as "president" or "chancellor" or some similar term. He is supposed to be the full-time professional administrator.

Actually, the most important single function performed by the trustees is the selection of the president. If they succeed in this, their troubles for the time being are over. If they fail, their troubles are continuous until the incumbent dies, resigns, retires or is removed, and a successful choice is made.

Now here is a curious paradox. Though the mortality rate among university presidents, physical and official, is (for them) alarmingly high, for the trustees in a particular institution the

term of service of the president is frequently longer than that of a majority of the board. From this it follows that the most important single function of the board may be exercised but once by the great majority of the members and not at all by a goodly number.

Hence the selection of the university president, the big moment, as it were, in the official life of the trustees comes but once for most of them and finds them quite unprepared and inexperienced. It is really small wonder that so many curious incidents are recorded. When they do their best, the chances of mistakes are bound to be high because there are no generally formulated and accepted criteria to help them. Their own training and experience have given them nothing to use as a guide-post.

Obviously, no formula can guarantee success. The inescapable hazards will always be great where the human element plays such a major rôle. Probably the hazards involved in selecting a university president will always be as great as the hazards of matrimony, say, with the added handicap that matrimony is now perhaps easier to terminate than the incumbency of a president. But just as in matrimony there are certain underlying factors that on the whole make for success or failure, in spite of numerous exceptions, so in the selection of a university president there are certain underlying considerations which will increase the probabilities of success or failure. It is our purpose to examine here a few of these considerations.

The starting point, obviously, is to determine, if possible, what qualities are important for such a position. That the ideal combination will never be found is no reason for not listing the desiderata, if possible in the order of their importance. The order of importance may, in fact, very well vary for different institutions, or even for the same institution at different times. But general agreement on the major factors of importance would be a great help for every one concerned, and that includes not only trustees, administrative officers, faculty and students, but also the supporters of the institutions, be they private donors or governmental bodies, and the larger society which the institutions are supposed to serve.

Requirement number one, then, is that the man chosen to head an educational institution should be an educator. That is in

itself a large order and by no means easy to define, and there is plenty of room for differences of opinion as to what an educator is. But the term is in common usage, and some attempt must be made to show what is meant by it in this connection. Certainly for one thing it means a man who has had long and thorough experience in the field of higher education as student, teacher and administrator. It excludes, *ab initio*, politicians, business men, professional men, preachers, writers, officers, public school men, or what have you, no matter how outstanding or distinguished they may be in their respective fields, unless they are also competent educators as above defined. That, it may be said, is not only practically never the case, but in the nature of things can hardly ever be the case. It takes the better part of a busy lifetime to become a qualified educator by experience, and the same is true of really distinguished men in any of the other walks of life enumerated above.

The curious notion entertained by a great many university trustees that some outstanding figure in public life or in business or in the professions would be a good man to select as president of their university rests on a misconception as to the true function of the head of an educational institution. Such men, no matter how able and distinguished, are disqualified as educators by the single fact of a complete lack of appreciation through long experience of the problems of a university.

To the counter-charge that a man who has spent all his lifetime in the "cloistered walls" of a university the world of reality is an unknown quantity, the answer is obvious. In the first place, there are no more "cloistered walls." In the second place, a man who spent his entire time within such walls as there are would be no "educator" in our definition of the term. He wouldn't even be an ordinarily intelligent human. From which may be deduced the obvious conclusion that merely "sticking around" a university for a lifetime does not in itself make an educator of a man, even though he may have to "stick around" for a goodly number of years to become one.

It may appear to be piling Ossa upon Pelion to say that to be an educator a man must first be educated. But it may be helpful to remember that while a man can not be an educator in our sense of the term without being educated, he may be educated

without being an educator. By "educated" we designate the man who has in addition to the outward symbols of schooling, such as academic degrees and academic distinctions, that larger understanding and knowledge which may or not flow from the academic training, though theoretically it should. This is mainly a subjective characteristic of the individual and goes to make up his personality. The comic-strip absent-minded, impractical professor may in truth be a great scholar, but he is no educator to us, because in our sense of the term he is not even educated.

We take for granted that the personal qualities that are attributes of a first-class man in any man's language are demanded of a university president: honesty, courage, intellectual integrity, industry, fairness, sympathy, intelligence and a sense of honor. These are met with outside of academic halls of learning, to be sure, but they are to be found within the ranks of university men no less, "smart alecks" to the contrary notwithstanding. Indeed, it would be surprising if the percentage within the academic world were not markedly higher, for all the publicity that is given to those unfortunate members of the guild who happen to make public spectacles of themselves in one way or another.

University presidents should be chosen, then, from within the academic ranks. They should have made their marks, as students, teachers and scholars, and demonstrated their possession of the personal characteristics required to make an educational leader. Successful experience in this latter field as dean or other administrative officer is the best recommendation a board of trustees could hope to find for an otherwise promising prospect.

What age is the most promising for a prospective president? Here we are faced with a most vital consideration about which there is the greatest confusion, both in theory and in practice. There was a time when a man was not considered for such a post as university president until he was around sixty, almost old enough in fact to retire from everything else. More recently there seems to have been an epidemic of selecting men not yet really grown-up, and institutions have boasted about having the "youngest" president. God save the mark!

The problem is really very simple, for all the confusion that surrounds it. It is obviously not just a matter of birthdays.

Health is a fundamental consideration, of course, but some men are in better health at sixty than they were at forty, and better insurance risks than lots of others younger than they are. It is principally a matter of outlook, and while many a man of sixty is mentally more vigorous and progressive than a great many men twenty years younger, the general rule that as a man grows older he grows more cautious and conservative and becomes, therefore, more suited to give counsel than to provide action is almost inescapable, in spite of brilliant exceptions.

An interesting angle on the age problem is the fact that trustees are frequently influenced in favor of a young man on the theory that they will "get more years of service" out of him than out of an older man. True enough, but unfortunately experience has demonstrated that after the first ten years, the additional years of service are quite as likely to be a liability as an asset for the institution. In the process of university administration, even the best, disappointments and grievances, real and imaginary, on the part of the faculty against the administration accumulate much more rapidly and effectively than do appreciation and loyalty, and by the end of a ten-year period the balance has almost always begun to swing the other way, no matter how favorable the auspices under which the president started. Moreover, contrary to a belief widely held by members of university faculties, the life of a conscientious university president is not the life of a Reilly. Their disappointments are his as well, and he has a lot of his own besides. At the end of ten years or so he is likely to be a very tired man, no matter how able or apparently successful. A change is indicated for him as well as for the institution, irrespective of the attained age.

If it were an established principle that no man would serve as president for more than ten years, the quest for youth just for the sake of a greater life expectancy would be abandoned, and many grave errors would be avoided. The very exceptional cases in which trustees and faculty would agree that no man could be found to succeed acceptably the incumbent of ten years' standing might be met by an interim administration during which the president be sent off at university expense for a year's travel or recreation after the termination of his ten years' service, while a successor is being sought. If no suitable one can actually be

found, he might be appointed anew for a limited term of five years while the search for a successor continues.

The problem of what to do with the ex-presidents stands in the way of such a sensible solution at the present time. Voluntary retirement is almost unknown even when there is an age limit and a pension, except in case of ill health, and not always then. Compulsory retirement almost always carries with it an atmosphere of ill will and resentment that makes the presence of an ex-president around an institution undesirable. But the honorable completion of a ten-year term of service, with no expectation of continued office, would enable a man either to step into another presidential position elsewhere if he is still young enough, to enter some other field of endeavor in which his experience as an educational administrator might be desired or to continue as a professor in his chosen field of specialization, the ten-year absence from which should not be a serious handicap if he has kept mentally alert.

We return then to the problem of age, with the basic assumption that the younger the man consistent with adequate and demonstrated capacity, the better the chance for ten years of maximum usefulness to the institution. Now and then a child prodigy or boy wonder may make good in the field of university administration, as in other fields, which is not very often. But actual experience is all against it. Even an outstanding man will require ten to fifteen years to achieve and demonstrate maturity as a teacher and scholar, and another five years to gain experience as administrator. If he starts at twenty-five, which is about as young as he can be if he secures the requisite professional training to become a university teacher, the lower age limit would be from forty to forty-five, with the latter much more promising.

In view of the many hazards in the way of advancement in proportion to merit in the academic world, many of the really best men may not have had the opportunity to demonstrate their full capacities until the age of fifty-five. If such men have their health and have kept their youthful outlook, they would be from every point of view a better risk for the trustees seeking a president than some marvel fifteen years younger, who with a better sense of salesmanship has pushed himself to the front with an attractive window display. There are, unfortunately, patent

medicine men in the university field, as there are in preaching, medicine, law and business.

If the man under consideration has the necessary qualities and experience, trustees need not be concerned about what his field of specialization has been before embarking upon administrative activities. Provided the man's achievements as student, teacher and scholar are outstanding, and provided he has the desirable personal qualifications, it makes no difference whether he specialized in the natural sciences or the social sciences, medicine, engineering, or law. The attributes required are much more fundamental than the question of what particular field of endeavor in the university field has been pursued.

Where shall the trustees look for such a man? Here we come to a much more difficult problem than the problem of what kind of a man to look for. The answer is difficult because there is no recognized and authoritative agency to aid them in their search. There can not be the slightest question that for such a position the often caricatured maxim that the post should seek the man is basic. Any man who becomes openly or *sub rosa* an applicant or candidate for a university presidency should be automatically ruled out of consideration. But one reason for the fact that many men do become candidates, nevertheless, lies in the fact that there is no established procedure for making sure that promising possibilities will come to the attention of a board seeking a president.

I am not speaking here of nepotism, political or religious pressure or personal favoritism, which, however potent here and there in the actual selection of university presidents, are recognized by all right-minded trustees as beneath contempt. I am speaking of the part played by mere chance in this vital matter, owing to the absence of a reputable procedure. There are hundreds, if not thousands, of men in our universities who have just as good qualifications as those who are chosen presidents, and some who are much better, and yet have never been under consideration. If the university presidency is to become a career to which really able men entering the university fields may look forward with some degree of certainty provided they have the "stuff," some orderly method will have to be provided.

My suggestion is theoretically very simple. Let there be a central clearing house of personnel information, in connection

with some such body as the American Council on Education, in which current information concerning men in university administrative positions will be available. This information could be easily compiled by correspondence supplemented by personal interviews. There, any board of trustees or any committee of a board or any individual member could secure an up-to-date roster of presidents, deans and other administrative officers, running into hundreds and even thousands, from which a list of prospects meeting the particular requirements they have in mind could readily be compiled.

It is true, of course, that the current list of deans and presidents not only does not include all those who are the best prospects for university presidencies, but also includes a great number who are not prospects of any kind. This is partly due to the fact that a man may prove a good dean who would not prove a good president, for a great variety of reasons. That can not be changed. But it is also partly due to the fact that many deans and other administrative officers have themselves been chosen by a haphazard, incomplete and inaccurate process in the first place. That can be helped.

Supplementing the personnel record of actual deans and other administrative officers, there could easily be maintained another list of potential deans or administrators. Many institutions are fortunate in having potential administrative material in excess of their own requirements or opportunities. While university presidents are not likely to send out letters of recommendation to administrative positions elsewhere for members of their own faculty, except at the invitation of the other institution or the request of the faculty member, partly because they do not know of the vacancies, actual or contemplated, they could certainly not refuse to furnish to a recognized personnel agency of the kind indicated above information about competent faculty members who have manifested an interest in the administrative side of university work.

It may be inferred from the above considerations that deans and presidents should be chosen from outside the ranks of the institution itself. As a general rule that is true for deans, and especially is it true for presidents. There are arguments both ways, of course. But there is no question that many a man

would make an excellent dean or president in some other institution, who would not do as well in his own. The simple fact is that after ten or fifteen years on a university faculty, a man is bound to have special friends, and, if he is any good, special enemies as well, or at least pet aversions. The handicap of having special friends and special enemies at the outset in the group over which he is to preside is an enormous additional hazard to an administrator in an already extra-hazardous undertaking. It can be overcome only in very exceptional cases.

The disadvantage that able men within the institution would feel injured by the bringing in of an outsider would of course disappear with the general practice of looking for administrative officers wherever special capacities have demonstrated themselves. In any case the resentment of the disappointed aspirants against an outsider would not be likely to be as deep-seated as against one of their own colleagues whom they believed from observation to be less qualified than themselves.

In conclusion, perhaps a few "don'ts" would be as helpful as any summary to trustees faced with the problem of hunting a university president:

Don't expect your choice to be a "business man." The business sense should be furnished by the trustees. That is their function *par excellence*. If he is as intelligent as he should be, he will readily understand whatever of business is involved apart from educational policies.

Don't look for an "expert in education." There is no such animal. An educated man with sufficient experience in the university field and the qualities requisite for a university president learns as he goes along and doesn't imagine he knows it all when he starts.

Don't look for a "money raiser," whether by private begging or by legislative lobbying. If he is a competent president he will inspire confidence, naturally, whether among philanthropists or legislators. But the trustees are the ones to see that funds are forthcoming to carry out the plans which their supposedly intelligent choice of a president can convince them are reasonable and feasible.

Don't demand a "public speaker." Ability to make a convincing address is no doubt a great asset. But, barring physical

disability of some kind, which a presidential possibility should not have anyway, any intelligent man can make a decent speech about anything he is informed on. The platform orator is so likely to become enamored with the sound of his own voice and his ability to sway audiences, that before long it makes little difference to him what he says. And then the harm is done, for the disease is incurable.

Don't insist on knowing a man's political or religious affiliations. His philosophy of life is important, but his membership in a political party or a religious sect is not.

Finally, don't expect a paragon of virtues such as you have never known. If you found him he would be so far above not merely the faculty, but the trustees themselves that he would be impossible to live with. There are plenty of A-1 men who will do a "bang-up" job while still falling short of the glory of God.

Selah!

WHAT MAKES A GOOD TRUSTEE?

A GOOD trustee is more than a name, even a famous name, on a roster.

A good trustee is more than a faithful attendant at meetings, although he must be that.

A good trustee is more than a complacent well-wisher for the institution he seeks to serve.

But these are generalizations, minimum essentials. What kind of men and women does Hiram hope to attract to her Board of Trustees?

A good trustee is one who believes whole-heartedly in education. This belief includes a faith that education can produce vital and significant changes in young men and women, changes that affect the entire personality, and changes on which the future of civilization must depend. This belief includes a faith that education is one of the major businesses in life.

A good trustee is one who represents his institution with pride, who is alert to her interests and eager to bring her new success. He is one who speaks with satisfaction of "my" college. It is a fair statement to make that many of the gifts to education come through the willingness of some college trustee to recommend "his" institution to his friends.

A good trustee is one who, while concerned for the total welfare of the institution, seeks some definite place of service for which his experience and training have fitted him: supervision of endowment investments, attention to physical attractiveness of grounds, oversight of public relations, assistance in medical or sanitary service, counsel on legal or architectural matters, etc.

A good trustee is one who is easily available for counsel on problems of his institution, willing to advise, and yet tolerant of differences of opinion and administrative action that may not always follow his proposals.

A good trustee is one who is constantly seeking new friends for his institution, friends whose interests and good will may increase the effectiveness and prestige of the college.

A good trustee is one who finds joy and satisfaction in being a partner in the college's task of making men, an investor in youth.

* From the Hiram College publication, *From HIRAM*, March, 1938.

TEN COMMANDMENTS OF A COLLEGE PRESIDENT*

I. Thou shalt not pass the buck to thy trustees, as saith a famous prexy (David Starr Jordan).

II. Thou shalt not forget thou wast young once thyself.

III. Thou shalt not crack down on the freedom of teachers nor suppress the spirit of free inquiry.

IV. Thou shalt never double-cross thy dean nor do anything you can get somebody else to do.

V. Thou shalt not accept gifts with compromising conditions, but thou shalt fulfil to the letter every promise, for thou knowest the saying of old that "All college presidents are liars."

VI. Thou shalt never promise but be ever chary in granting honorary degrees. To avoid scandal and the frowns of the foundations and regional associations, let all degrees be recommended by the faculty and approved by the trustees.

VII. Thou shalt not fail to give thanks for every gift to thy college be it ever so small, for remember, O man, that all that thou hast was given.

VIII. Thou shalt observe the strictest comity with thy neighbors, remembering that they too are serving the kingdom of light.

IX. Thou shalt not play favorites—particularly the boys of thine own fraternity, knowing that an institution as well as a man must be fair and honest.

X. Thou shalt resign promptly whenever thy trustees and prospective donors come to hate the sound of thy voice as thou callest for more cash. Mayhap they will heed a new voice calling them to sacrifice for beloved Alma Mater.

* As presented to Mount Union Alumni Association June 13, 1938, by Dr. William Henry McMaster, retiring as president after twenty-nine years of service.

ONE-TYPE COLLEGE DOOMED*

WALTER B. PITKIN

PROFESSOR OF JOURNALISM, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

IN hard times only the strong survive. If all American colleges and universities continue their present policies for the next quarter century, fully 450 of them will pass from the scene by 1960. The physical equipment will remain but the activities within the ivy-clad walls will not constitute what we know today as college life and functions.

And of the 745 listed colleges and universities in America today another 150 will survive as such only through becoming marginal institutions, with lowered standards to tap the supply of borderline students who will go to a college whether or not it is the best thing for them.

The remaining 150-odd institutions will survive, some improving, some holding their own as a result of academic, social-economic, or geographical qualities.

This will be no tragedy. Foresight of the trend may well result in the salvation of institutions now struggling pitifully along under an outmoded concept which survives only through the force of tradition.

There is not room in tomorrow's America for 745 colleges and universities of the standard American brands, comprised today chiefly of liberal arts, agricultural, and technical institutions. The liberal arts college, far in the majority today, will continue to have its place in education, but not ever in its present over-expanded form.

That a shake-up in the colleges will come is inevitable. Population no longer grows as of old. Soon it will be stationary. Frank Bowles, director of Columbia admissions, has cited his findings of a falling off in public-school attendance and prophesied the collapse of or lowering of standards in colleges depending upon student fees for existence. With fewer high school graduates fewer candidates will seek admission to the colleges.

But other trends are also at work. The marginal colleges face their downfall for many complex reasons, chief among which are:

*Reprinted from *Columbia Alumni News*, March 18, 1938.

1. A relative decline in opportunities formerly monopolized by college students.

2. Increasing opportunities for high-grade people to do work calling for only average abilities.

It is no secret that the liberal arts degree holds little charm as an entree to employers, aside from the professions. The battle for jobs grows grimmer. It is the first thought of the public-school graduate. America's youth as a group cannot afford to spend four years for a general education. The better colleges are themselves the leaders in pricking the myth that a bachelor's degree is a certificate of employment. As youth becomes more and more conscious that experience is the best entering wedge into non-professional employment, applications for college admission will continue to decline. Eventually we will see that happy day when only those who should be in college will be there.

Not only will those ill-fitted for college soon stay away, but high-grade people who formerly made good subjects for advanced education are finding more and more that in the struggle for a livelihood they can do well by hitching their wagons to a planet instead of a star. And the best planet is the one they live on. By stepping down a rung on the ladder they find, in the fields formerly below their dignity, that it is easier to compete. He who might have made a fair lawyer yesterday may now abandon the law degree and enter a business concern, where part of his duties may entail legal advice, yet where he will never practise law. And he will get a four-year advantage over his schoolmates who go on toward the college degree.

Again the better colleges are leaders in the trend. The Columbia Law School is, perhaps, the top-notch discourager of prospective degree-holders. Unless he has definite promise of high attainment in law, no candidate is permitted to enter that professional school. In the past ten years the Law School has forcefully whittled its attendance down in an endeavor to accept and graduate only those who are assured of success. This must become the iron rule in every professional school. The world demands better graduates and fewer.

What qualities determine the survival of tomorrow's college? The quality of teaching ranks high here. Advantages of location have their obvious merits. High-grade institutions in great

population centers need not fear the future. Other survivors may be found among colleges having special social-economic status and connections. Since, regardless of their service, institutions tend to survive as long as they can exist, financial support will continue to figure largely. The best state universities can and will continue, as will the colleges carried through adequate church support. Private institutions will depend upon the number of good scholarships or endowments by alumni.

What of the 450-odd colleges doomed through lack of quality and support? Their doom should be welcome, since they exist in their present form without reason. They perform no service.

But their buildings and grounds will continue to be, and many of them may become boarding schools. Probably most of those which fail to act soon will end up in that category if they do not close their doors altogether.

But there is a service which they could easily perform, a service which is needed.

Marginal colleges should get away from the idea of the one-type college. Each one, individually, should and can enter a new, noncompetitive field.

The educational field is glutted with the standard college, yet starved for specialized schools of many types. The blind, the deaf and the crippled are in need of more and better training facilities. Industrial schools supplying apprentices in industry are scarce, and mostly focused upon the broader industrial fields such as engineering and mining.

Specialties abound and increase today. Those destined to reach the top of their professions still require the broader outlook, but he who will be an aviator, or a roofing salesman, or an air-conditioning expert or an advertising layout man and go not far beyond the \$4,000 a year class can only find scattered classes and imperfect courses in the larger schools.

Four hundred and fifty small colleges facing obliteration could and should find four hundred and fifty noncompetitive, modest specialties where there will always be a demand and where they can always serve those who would learn.

What could they do? The large business schools prepare men for high executive positions. Other phases of business life are neglected by our educational institutions. Most youngsters

who head into business do not rise to high executive positions, though most of them do aspire to be more than secretaries. Yet our business colleges of today are classed into two brackets, the secretarial schools and the schools of economic theory. The great middle bracket which should produce competent junior executives is almost nonexistent. Liberal arts colleges which are now going under while attempting to pay the mortgage on their stadia would do well to inquire into the feasibility of a new type business school, specialized to the extent that it teaches mainly practical phases of the type of work which a junior executive will do.

Today the entire business of transportation is headed for a reorganization. Transportation is one of many fields which will always exist. But no accredited residential college in the country specializes in transportation as a profession.

A few schools of aviation laid on the foundations of some defunct art colleges would survive very nicely. The recent government inquiry into the causes of airplane accidents has revealed several chief contributors. One is fatigue caused by nervous tension in trying to manœuvre a ship while watching the enormous instrument boards. This simple fact points to the need for larger crews. More trained men will be needed in the future. Who will train them?

Aviation and transportation are but two opportunities for small college specialties. There are as many more as there are human pursuits, but the one-type college persists in the main today.

THE COLLEGE AND CULTURE*

WILLIAM H. COWLEY
PRESIDENT, HAMILTON COLLEGE

TODAY Hamilton College begins its one hundred and twenty-seventh year. Appropriately as a new year starts we pause to do honor to the students of past generations who have sat in your seats, to the departed faculty members who have taught in these halls, to the ten presidents who have stood at this rostrum, and to the trustees and alumni who have sustained the college. All of us in this chapel this morning are here only because of the deep and strong foundations which these men of the past have laid, and fittingly we commemorate their devotion and their labors.

No less fittingly the beginning of a new year, and especially the beginning of a new administration, suggests an appraisal of the present. College students are thought to have a number of concerns which are peculiarly their own: athletics, fraternities, student organizations, house parties, and the like. Of these we together shall have much to say as they come into focus during the year. Today, however, I would direct your attention to a broader and more important horizon: the relationship of American college students in the year 1938 to the confused and jittery world in which we live.

During the next few weeks nearly a million and a half young men and women will gather in meetings like this in the colleges and universities of the United States. In no other country of the world is such a large proportion of the youthful population privileged to live in relative leisure preparing, presumably, for a larger contribution to society in years to come. Many an observer of the American scene insists that we can't possibly afford such extravagance, that the shallowness, ignorance, and downright stupidity of college students and college graduates make our entire enterprise of higher education a huge caricature. I heard the other day, for example, of a college graduate who queried of an acquaintance whether or not the planetarium in New York raises peonies and in which state Washington, D. C., is located. This particular Bachelor of Arts

* Opening address to students, Hamilton College, September 15, 1938.

may be an exception, but the existence of even a few such persons gives point to comparing the light-heartedness, if not the light-headedness, of American college students with the plight of their fellows in other nations.

Were you Germans instead of Americans, only one in twenty of you would be here, and that one in twenty would have been chosen by the state. The rest of you would be in labor camps for six months of hard physical drudgery upon the public works of the Nazi state followed by a year of compulsory military service preparing to become carrion or to be gassed or shell-shocked or maimed in the war that seems soon to be inevitable. In Italy, Japan, France, and Russia your lot would be much the same: a relatively small number of you would be in college, and all of you whether in college or not would be preparing for war.

In Spain and China you'd be at the front. Even in England many if not most of you would be working in munition and armament factories, and all of you would be ordered out every week for gas mask and air raid drills.

In the totalitarian states your time and your opportunities would not only be regimented but also your thinking. You would be not only a physical and political but also an intellectual and spiritual creature of the state. You would find the attention of the government continuously focused upon you, and because the future is in the hands of youth, you would have been drilled from childhood in the molds of thinking designed by the dictator. A year ago last May Hitler, describing his methods, declared:

First of all, we made a start with the Nation's youth. There are still among us old fogies who are no longer good for anything. According to their leanings, they stand either to the right or to the left. . . . But this does not disturb us. We take away their children. These we will train and educate to become new Germans. . . . We will take them when they are ten years old and bring them up in the spirit of the community until they are eighteen. . . . Later on they will do two years of military service. Who shall dare say that such training will not produce a nation!*

The same educational indoctrination is being practised in every one of the totalitarian states. The dictators know that the future

* *The New York Times*, May 2, 1937.

will be controlled by the generation coming to maturity, and they are taking no chances on what or how it will think.

This chaotic situation abroad may seem to have little if anything to do with you who are protected by democratic institutions, who can come to college or not as you please, and who can not only think what you like about the head of the government but also say it wherever and whenever you feel inclined. We are not, however, immune either from the forces which have produced the political and economic disasters abroad or from the consequences of these disasters. Despite the frenzied red-hunters we can set up no tariff walls which will keep out foreign political doctrines. Nor can we inoculate America against the results of the tensions and torsions of economic dislocation.

More than that we are an idealistic people, and it is significant that the highly-reliable Gallup poll demonstrated a startling shift in public opinion when Japan invaded China last year. Until then the poll had indicated that the American people supported the existing neutrality law, but with Japan running amuck in Asia the majority of Americans expressed their sympathy for China by changing their attitudes toward neutrality. You are all too young to know anything about the power of war-making propagandists, but we who lived through the World War know that if a major war breaks out in Europe, America will immediately find itself barraged by such subtle, such convincing propaganda that it will be next to impossible for us to stay out of the conflagration. Our economy, moreover, so unmistakably interweaves with that of Europe that our political experts are wagering with one another about how long we can keep aloof.

And you who are sitting here today as students of Hamilton College, together with your contemporaries in other colleges and in the factories and offices of the country, will fight that war. We of older generations will be largely exempt, but you will go off in airplanes and tanks and battleships to sacrifice or disjoint your lives because, as Elihu Root pointed out six weeks before the World War broke out, "interdependence is taking the place of self-dependence,"* and because today no nation can live unto itself alone.

* Address as Honorary Chancellor of Union University, June 10, 1914.

The forces that control society are so large and so powerful that there is little that you and I can do to stop or even divert the immediate onrush. The future, however, is yours. More than with any other groups it rests in the hands of the men and women who are privileged to attend college. If future wars are to be prevented, you must prevent them. If the economic causes of war are to be removed, you must remove them. If social justice is to dominate the thinking and action of men, you must set and enforce the standards. In brief, in peaceful Hamilton College you must begin to prepare for responsibilities as great as those faced by any generation in history.

This morning I should like briefly to explore the nature of this preparation. Liberal arts college students are presumably devoting their time to acquiring culture. The pursuit of culture is allegedly the best possible preparation for meeting the problems of our feverish world. I should like to analyze that concept and to discuss its relationship to our lives on College Hill.

Despite its deeply entrenched position in liberal arts colleges the culture concept is relatively new in educational history. It came in with Matthew Arnold in the eighteen sixties and seventies, and unfortunately it has confused educators ever since. Arnold defined culture as "a disinterested endeavor after perfection" and a familiarity "with the best that has been thought and said in the world." He emphasized personal culture and deplored Huxley's insistence that science is culture and Carlyle's booming pronouncements that work is culture. More than that he lived too soon to learn of the illuminating work of the cultural anthropologists who have, it seems to me, pointed the way out of the jumble into which Arnold tossed us.

The achievements of the anthropologists are best clarified in German rather than in English. The Germans make a distinction between two types of culture: personal culture about which Arnold chiefly wrote, and group culture about which the anthropologists write. Personal culture they call *Bildung*. Group or social culture they call *Kultur*. For example, cultivating an interest in poetry or symphonic music or plastic art is essentially personal culture or *Bildung*. Or developing one's intellectual range or one's moral sense or one's physique. These endeavors are all basically individualistic and make one a finer, keener,

more companionable person. No college of liberal arts can justify its existence which fails to promote *Bildung* or personal culture.

But *Kultur* or group culture is no less important. Indeed, personal culture depends upon the state of group culture. Economic and political institutions, law and custom, education, religion, traditional knowledge, technology, recreation, and art—these all determine the status of a group culture. In America we live in a culture different from, for example, that of the Polynesians of the South Sea Islands. Our traditions are different, our knowledge, our institutions. Indeed, our Anglo-Saxon culture differs from that of any other race of people. Until recently we have been rather positive about its superiority, and most of us still think it superior despite the flouting of democracy by more than half of Europe. We have free schools, a free press, religious freedom, and—as so eloquently demonstrated during recent weeks in South Carolina and California—a free ballot box. These are the foundation stones of our American culture. Without them our opportunities for personal culture would change completely if not entirely disappear. Witness the regimentation of all personal culture in Germany and every other dictator-dominated state. If I could, I would write indelibly upon the mind of every college man and woman in America this axiom: the opportunity for personal culture depends upon the state of group culture.*

For the liberal arts college this means, it seems to me, that we must cease putting all of our emphasis upon personal culture. We must think also in terms of group culture: our schools, our press, our religious freedom, our inherited right to free discussion. With the world in its present jumbled and jumpy state the responsibility of the college does not end with providing opportunities for personal culture. Such a limited and limiting

* Three days after the delivery of this address the *New York Times* published (Sept. 18, 1938) the following statement from the pen of Thomas Mann, distinguished German author who is living as an exile in Switzerland: "We know well enough that in the life of a people the idea of culture, at least in its purely esthetic sense, need not always stand in the foreground of consciousness and interest; that there are times when more difficult, more urgent and even greater things are at stake than the beautiful, and at such epochs the muses must moderate their pretensions. . . ."

objective leads to the ivory tower of isolation and to a cloistered unawareness of, if not disdain for, the large affairs of the world. It leads to a self-conscious collecting of culture and neglects the supreme responsibility of all educated men and women to protect group culture, our greatest heritage from the past.

I would particularly urge upon you the point of view that college students should *prepare* to protect and develop our democratic culture rather than rush into the business of protecting it before you have learned the issues involved. I am personally emphatically opposed to students becoming *active* partisans in political and economic disputes. I believe heartily in student forums such as those at Harvard, Yale, Chicago, and dozens of other institutions, but student participants in picket lines and in marches upon legislatures to encourage or denounce legislation unrelated to their own educational opportunities strikes me as a travesty upon the purposes of education. The job of the college student is to prepare for the responsibilities of citizenship by acquiring background in the development of the race and in the movement of ideas which have produced our present difficulties. One of the great tragedies of war is that this preparation is suddenly halted, and a generation grows up of necessity trained to act before investigating the facts and thinking out their implications. Now more insistently than ever before we need youths who are willing to forego the delights of an immediate fight for the ardors of preparing for a more intelligent and more conclusive fight after you have had the training for it. The best way to protect our democratic culture is to build the deep and broad foundations for which the liberal college has historically stood. You must protect our democratic culture, but first you should learn why and how.

These are highly charged days through which we live. It's any man's guess whether the world will be tumbled into catastrophe or whether we can avert the threatening disaster. This crisis may pass, but another will follow, and if we are lucky you who sit here this morning as students may be able to complete your college courses and take your places in the topsy-turvy world. Meanwhile we have lives to live here on College Hill, and we must live them tomorrow and the day after tomorrow. Our concern for the lightning flashes across the sky must not inter-

fere with intelligent and fruitful participation in the opportunities made for us—faculty and students alike—by Hamilton College.

* * * * *

We begin today a new chapter in the life of the college. No one knows whether or not it is to be dynamic and distinguished or dull and doubtful. Time will tell. I have high hopes. Many of you, I imagine, are curious about the direction in which I shall attempt to steer the college. The answer to that question is brief if not conclusive. I have no finished program to promote, no set of drawings of an ideal college after which I shall try to pattern Hamilton. Instead, I hope to do two things: first, to investigate thoroughly the facts about all divisions of our educational enterprise; and second, to enlist the intelligence and interest of all members of the Hamilton Family in the building and carrying forward of that program.

In these undertakings the student body has a large part to play. Although I am opposed to student participation in strikes and other such activities, I am completely committed to the philosophy that undergraduates have valuable contributions to make to the development of the college. In our own group culture here in Hamilton we must all make our contributions. Undergraduates will be better citizens because of working at their citizenship in the college community. I therefore crave the participation of the student body individually and collectively in the development of our distinguished college into even greater distinction. This is the best contribution that we as a group can make to the solution of the staggering problems that face our culture.

TEACHER TRAINING VERSUS TEACHER EDUCATION*

ALAN VALENTINE

PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

IT takes either a brave man or a foolhardy one to speak of the education of teachers, unless one is of the elect. I am not of the elect, which consists of professors of education, heads of normal schools, state officials, and all others who have made surveys. These are the experts; the rest of us are laymen. They are experts because they have taken the time to master the complicated systems of state requirements and the jargon of schools of education. They are also experts because they admit it. I am, without regret, a layman, and I admit it. Any experts here will endure my remarks with that restrained irritation and conscious tolerance all experts feel toward laymen. I cannot hope for more than mercy from them. But I boldly attempt this topic because I expect understanding and sympathy from other laymen here.

I propose to talk about the education of teachers because it is high time some layman representing the old, stodgy liberal arts college point of view spoke right out in meeting about it. The importance of the subject is obvious—obvious economically because there are a million school teachers teaching thirty-three million pupils at an annual cost of \$3,000,000,000; obvious socially and politically because of the effect that teaching can have; and obviously of personal importance to you since you represent the 1,700 organizations of higher education (a purely comparative term) involved in the training of school teachers. Few of these 1,700 institutions are satisfied with the present method of training teachers, and those few are not the fine flower of American higher education.

College people have done much private and disjointed complaining about the present training of teachers, with little effect. For that ineffectiveness we of the colleges are largely to blame; by hiding our heads in the sand we have failed to protect ourselves and the ideal of education we represent. We have left the education of teachers to the experts I have described. They are experts in their mastery of the present system, but we are or ought to be competent to participate in a matter so important to society.

* Reprinted from *The Educational Record* for July, 1938, published by the American Council on Education.

Our opinions are as likely as theirs to be detached and disinterested. We need not be unduly modest, for we are not likely to make teacher training any worse than they will make it without us.

Before I pursue my remarks further, I should like to make clear to all of you the areas of teacher education to which my critical remarks do not apply, and ask you to keep these points definitely in mind during the balance of my remarks. Please do not infer that my criticisms apply to every aspect of the work of departments of education, or to every individual concerned with it. I do not deplore all professional training for teachers, or all subjects that are taught by departments of education. In this professional field a few real experts have done much, and I hope will do more, to advance the cause of genuine scholarship throughout the country, and the cause of sound cultural education for prospective teachers. Proper technical training is doubtless of value to most and perhaps all intending teachers, so long as the proper balance is kept between that purely technical training and major educational values. It would certainly be wrong to condemn the whole professional side of teacher education, and I do not condemn it. Lest you think me unfamiliar with the wide variety of courses taught in many departments of education, I hasten to assert my recognition that education courses as a whole do not deal with method alone. I am aware of the values of certain courses offered by departments of education, or their potential value, in presenting to intending teachers and others the problems of education as a great social institution. Please bear these convictions in mind as I proceed.

If education is what I think it is, then school teachers are not getting enough of it for their own good, and not enough to justify turning them loose upon boys and girls. Poor teachers will literally be the death of us, for if qualitative standards in schools continue to decline, we who depend on their product will have to lower our standards or give up altogether. Everyone knows that is true, but we have been too busy explaining away the fact to go about changing it. I say this with full appreciation of those many who have labored long in this enormous and chaotic vineyard, with great success quantitatively. We owe a great debt to those few who have tried to maintain or elevate qualitative standards. Among the latter I number a

few men in state departments of education, like Commissioner Graves and Associate Commissioner Horner in New York, who for years have tried to stand off the waves of mediocrity and political pressure groups around them. In spite of such efforts as theirs, school education is qualitatively poorer now than it was before the war, and can easily become worse.

It is poor qualitatively because we have concentrated on quantitative problems. Fatal in theory, that policy is proving fatal in practice. We have an unfortunate national propensity for trying to deal with problems of quality in terms of quantity—if we want to make something better we make it bigger; hence the President's Supreme Court proposals and the National City Bank! Quantity production often brings new and worse problems of decline in quality, and this has happened in public school teaching and personnel. School men are not primarily to blame, and some of them deserve high honor for their achievements against heavy odds; but we must blame the forces of society that put many a weak school man where he is instead of someone stronger. Thousands of school teachers with little education have been turning out hundreds of thousands of school graduates with less education, and so on into the next generation. And as the quality of education declines, the assumption that the nation is educated mounts.

Part of this decline in quality results from overemphasis upon training teachers in teaching techniques. This process takes time that should be spent educating teachers, so they can educate pupils. I have tried to point that contrast in the title of this paper. The usual phrase currently applied by professional educators is "teacher training." As a description of the process that phrase is all too accurate. Teachers are being trained in techniques, but they are not always being educated. The system ignores any clear distinction between training and education, between techniques and the more important purposes those techniques should serve. One can train a soldier to do squads right, or a teacher to do the equivalent in the classroom, but neither performance offers any proof that the soldier or the teacher is educated. The worst aspect of this process is that a teacher who has been merely trained often assumes that he is educated.

Training teachers is useful—given the average material it may be essential—but it is no substitute for educating them. To

provide the training at a cost to the education is to put the cart before the horse. Both cannot be done in the present time allowance if so much time and energy must be given to the mastery of techniques. (I reserve my doubts as to whether all the techniques are in themselves beyond question.) At any rate, potential teachers are just placing their feet on the high road to an adequate education when they are deviated into mental calisthenics. After they have jumped through the hoops of so many hours in educational psychology (which is certainly not education and frequently not psychology), and then chinned themselves so many times on the bar of practice teaching, they are accepted as technically qualified to teach a subject they have had no time to master.

If I were alone in believing this situation absurd and harmful, I should hardly have the courage to speak so emphatically here. But I am not alone. In the offices and corridors of many colleges I have heard distinguished professors express similar views. Indeed, the recent study of this Council confirms the point. "Teachers," it states, "often lack adequate preparation in the subjects they teach." The report continues: "If public schools are to be effective they must have teachers with a broad background of general culture, and unquestioned professional skill." I support this statement, but submit that in practice the cultural background is underemphasized and the professional skill too narrowly interpreted. Considering all the steps taken since the last war to enhance professional skill, i.e., techniques, what proportional steps have been taken to improve the cultural background of the prospective teacher? I have it on the authority of a distinguished scholar and university president, who himself attended a normal school thirty years ago, that the normal school instruction today, as he knows it, is culturally on a lower level than it was before the war. And is it not likely that professional skill itself is being interpreted too narrowly along lines of uniform techniques? The measure of professional skill in a teacher is ability to teach successfully. Professors Whitehead, Bliss Perry, Kittredge, and Tinker possess professional skill—yet not one of them could or would qualify professionally today to teach in the public schools of their states. Colleges allow a wider interpretation of professional skill in their professors and with fairly successful results.

"Knowing how to teach is inseparable from—indeed it is but an extension of—knowing what to teach." Thus reads the American Council report. I applaud this statement for what it says, and even more for what it implies. *How* to teach, it says, is but an extension of *what* to teach; hence *what* to teach must come first, and is the essential foundation of *how* to teach. There must be a main structure before there is an extension—the latter is after all but a wing of the main building. I confess adherence to an outmoded conviction that most teachers, if they are intelligent people with something to say, will soon learn how to say it!

In short, the education of teachers, like the education they often promulgate, places too much emphasis on the outward aspects of education. There are other ways than athletics in which the educational side shows threaten to swallow the main tent. For example, the amassing of testing results is of little value unless the results are used to help the teacher help the student get a better education. Too often these results repose in office files, unused by members of the teaching staff, and valuable only to those testers who enhance personal reputations by writing monographs upon them. Too often, when testing results are used, they are used only by guidance officers poorly qualified to interpret them, because they are themselves poorly educated.

Another side show is the increasing emphasis upon practice teaching. This seems to me allied with theories of education which some call "progressive." Both are based upon the idea that one learns best through activity. Now, one may sometimes learn through activity, but never very much, and usually very expensively. Activity is chiefly valuable intellectually as com-motion analyzed in retrospect. A psychologist's cat must go through the same activity sixty times to learn how to secure a few drops of milk, but an intelligent human, by prefacing activity with thought, can get the milk at the first attempt. Learning by activity is a little like building character by football: The results do not convince one of the efficiency of the process.

Other expanding side shows, which are but devices, are regarded as panaceas. From current debates over the relative merits of junior and senior high schools, over guidance, child psychology, and cumulative measurement, over extra-curricular mental lollipops, and over the use of radio and cinema, one might infer that these panaceas solved fundamental problems

of education. But they are only devices, and excitement over them obscures the main issues, which are the quality of teaching and teaching personnel, and the intellectual quality of the subject taught.

Some of these distortions arise from regarding teacher training as vocational training. It is true that teaching is a vocation, and it should be a noble one. It will not be a noble one so long as teachers are scrambling for advancement in terms of trivial credits on a state-built paper adding machine. Present regulations stimulate potential teachers to meet paper requirements rather than to gain understanding. Teaching is an art as well as a profession; it is an art because it is concerned with human values. The good teacher transcends his curriculum and the methods taught him and becomes an artist. The present prescribed curriculum of teacher training does not attract but repels a young man or woman who regards teaching in that light. It attracts those whose timidity or mediocrity gladly accepts these devices that let them count their credit hours toward a teacher's certificate; who welcome this simple formula of accretionary acquisition, this adding-machine road to comparative security. If a student with initiative and a questioning mind essays a teacher training course, and continues it, the present system is admirably calculated to damp out the initiative and dull the mind to acceptance.

This question has another aspect. Good professors dislike trying to educate supine minds under a hampering system of paper requirements which they did not make, do not approve, and see drawing students from real education. Many of the best teachers in good colleges have washed their hands of the whole teacher training business. They also urge their best students to stay out of public school teaching. The result is clearly stated in the American Council report. "Recent studies have shown that the students who select teaching are, as a group, inferior in general ability to those entering a number of other fields of work." According to a report in the *New York Times* for March 11, the chairman of the Board of Examiners for New York City schools reports that, in general, candidates—the men in particular—from about two hundred colleges for teaching vacancies in that school system are drawn from the lower levels of the graduating classes. He inferred that the men evidently

attempted teaching only if they had difficulty getting jobs elsewhere. The Council and the chairman of the Board of Examiners of the New York City school system thus verify with the weight of their authority what deans and professors in liberal arts colleges have long known, and known the reason for!

No system of teacher training can make good teachers out of poor material. Our present system is highly inefficient because it tries to do this. Much of its raw material is mediocre, for the system fails to attract better. Thus it attracts, trains, and perpetuates mediocrity. As it does so, it distorts educational values in the minds of teachers themselves, and then in the minds of their pupils, and ultimately in society as a whole. We waste our breath in fulminating against public apathy to good scholarship, and public approval of the side shows of collegiate life, so long as our schools are dominated by many who do not know good scholarship from bad, and do not recognize the difference between a side show and the main performance.

These vehement strictures upon present procedures should indicate their remedies. We need a better quality of candidates for teaching positions, and more emphasis upon an understanding of education and of sound scholarship. To secure those ends there must be greater flexibility in certification requirements, and a better balance between education and professional techniques. This demands more active participation in teacher training by the most competent educators in the liberal arts colleges. Those colleges must regain their leadership in education by re-establishing the principle that a school teacher must above all else have a sound general education. All this requires a complete change in the teacher training policies of many state departments of education and normal schools, a complete change in the attitude of many college faculties, a considerable change in the type of young man and woman electing school teaching as a career, and some change in what society at large expects a school teacher to be.

Such basic changes appear hopeless. They are far from hopeless if the talents and forces represented here would do their part. A beginning must be made somewhere, and in a few words I shall try to suggest where.

Colleges and normal schools should set higher standards of intelligence, cultivation, and personality in admitting students to preparation for teaching. This is an appropriate time to

begin such a move, since there are indications that a falling birth rate will result in fewer children of school age and hence a decreasing demand for teachers. It would be wise, as President Conant has suggested, to stop an overproduction of professional teachers at the admitting level, and, before it is too late, to turn those aspirants least qualified for teaching into more congenial fields. There can be drastic rises in our qualifying standard for school teachers before we reach the level of a country like Germany in its happy days.

Certification authorities should make their requirements less rigid. They could study to advantage the experience of college admissions officers, who have found that flexibility in admissions requirements produces better material for college than rigid adherence to detailed requirements for admission. A student whose college or university believes him without question to be admirably qualified to teach should be given a chance in the public schools, even though he has not satisfied the present fixed professional requirements. Most of us believe that school and college education should be adapted when possible, without lowering standards, to the interests and ability of the individual student. Professional educators closely associated with the training of teachers are particularly emphatic in advocating this principle. Why do they not apply it to the training of teachers—a profession in which, more than any other, balanced and well-adjusted personalities and well-rounded abilities consistent with individual interests are needed? Yet it is in this very profession of teaching that the requirements of the last year or two of training are most rigid and inflexible.

A saner system of certification would draw into school teaching many students admirably qualified to teach, who now choose other careers. They are repelled by the present rigid professional requirements, or wisely do not wish to take the necessary time from education to meet them. A saner system of certification would help to win more effective support of teacher education by college faculties, many of which see little educational justification for the present requirements. They rarely recommend to their best students careers of public school teaching. If the interest and teaching enthusiasm of many good college faculties were thus drawn into teacher training, their influence would bring about a better balance between knowledge and technique.

In this connection, I must record the only statement in the recent American Council study with which I must profoundly differ. It is this:

One can easily be a competent scholar in a subject and still make little or no contribution in a program devoted to the preparation of teachers.

First and immediately, very few of us can "easily be a competent scholar"—unless one sets a lower standard of competence in scholarship than I like to think the Council committee would approve. But with more emphasis and concern I question the statement itself. No really competent scholar could come to grips with a program devoted to the preparation of teachers without making a most valuable contribution to it. A sense of competent scholarship and contact with it are just what the present teacher training program needs. Prospective young teachers need to be infused, by precept and example, with a sense of real scholarship, which few of them possess and many of them do not even know they lack. Even if they themselves could never become competent scholars, it is essential that they understand and respect good scholarship, and be able to distinguish between the real article and its imitation. If they cannot show their students that they respect and understand learning, their students will not respect and understand it, either.

There is also need for a detached and scientific inquiry into the necessity of the present practice teaching requirement. Should so many hours of practice teaching be an absolute requirement for all? Are there not cases in which a broader and deeper understanding of the subjects to be taught would be in the long run more valuable than a running start into the technique of instructing a class? Colleges and universities select young men for instructorships largely on the basis of their scholarship and promise. They often give three-year appointments to young men who have not had any teaching experience. They estimate a candidate's chances of becoming a good teacher, but they do not take a poor scholar even if he thinks he teaches well. If such young instructors have been wisely chosen, they usually prove satisfactory teachers, sometimes even brilliant ones, under conditions no less exacting than those in the schools. Some of the best teachers in college now, and in school in my time, never read a book on educational psychology, or underwent formal instruction in teaching. Their methods of instruction differ

widely; each has worked out his own method consistent with his own personality. Formalized instruction in teaching methods might have robbed them of the very originality that makes them effective.

Advocates of compulsory practice teaching use medical internships as an argument. The parallel between internships in medicine and practice teaching for schools is not a sound one. No medical student enters upon internship until after he has really mastered his subject of medicine—for reasons obvious to those who go to hospitals as patients. But most teaching candidates have not mastered their subjects of instruction, as the American Council report clearly states. In time spent in intensive content education, those who begin practice teaching are from three to four years behind the medical student beginning his internship. We are far more cautious about turning a hospital patient over to an intern than we are about turning thirty defenseless school children over to a far less qualified practice teacher.

But "the function of teaching is changing," says the report, and cites a changing world and its rapidly increasing body of knowledge as support for that statement. Facts are changing and demands are changing, the content of education is changing, but in what way is the essential function of teaching changing? Was not good teaching always concerned, should it not always be concerned, with stimulating a love of knowledge, a pursuit of truth, a search for an understanding of the relations of things, and a desire to know and encourage students along the lines of their abilities? I submit that without any alteration in his "function of teaching" and without any use of modern teaching devices, Henry Adams, with no practice teaching or in-service training 1938 model, could teach history today better than most modern history teachers in school or college. We need a clearer distinction between the essentials, and the impedimenta, of the art of teaching.

There is another point upon which ground can be cleared. That point concerns the cost of teacher education. In implied apology for the present state of affairs, I have heard it said that real improvement must await vastly increased financial support. The American Council report, for example, states, "The financial support of institutions for the education of teachers is inadequate." This statement is true but itself inadequate, since

it does not state the whole truth. An ideal system of teacher education throughout the nation doubtless depends on a larger total budget for national education than now exists. But there are ways by which teacher education could be vastly improved without notable increased costs. I have suggested some of them. Teacher education would have a better claim for further financial support if it utilized now all the fine facilities available. It does not do so. I should like to amend the sentence from the Council report to read as follows: "Given the present inability of many private colleges to enter upon an effective scale into teacher education and thus to make a reasonable part of their large endowments indirectly effective in teacher education, the financial support of institutions for the education of teachers is inadequate." If Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Dartmouth, Williams, and Amherst, for example, were able to qualify, upon their terms, a reasonable proportion of their students for teachers' certificates, teacher education would gain not only qualitatively but financially by drawing upon their facilities. If these colleges were effective in teacher education, as they obviously are not under present rules, then there would be at least some institutions for the education of teachers whose financial support is adequate. If certificating boards would revise regulations and permit such institutions to enter the teacher education field, then their large endowments would become in proportion available for teacher education.

If those who write the rules want the faculties and endowments of good liberal arts colleges to assist with real enthusiasm in teacher education, they must provide a teacher education program which those faculties feel is worth supporting. This is not the case at present; nor will it be the case until the rules of the game are changed. The number of public school teachers now graduated from such institutions is exceedingly low compared with what it might be under happier circumstances.

Such a plan—the utilization of existing teaching resources of high quality and of existing endowments—seems to me more sensible economically and educationally than proposals, such as those now being pressed in New York state, for the creation of more normal schools or for the theoretical elevation of normal schools into colleges offering a four-year bachelor's degree. Regardless of the great cost to the taxpayer of new teacher training institutions, or of turning normal schools into colleges, that pro-

cedure would frequently mean merely the further extension of existing mediocrity. If the money needed for that undertaking were used for scholarships to help good potential teachers through good colleges, wonders would be worked. Only two impediments stand in the way—special interests and certification requirements.

Wherein lies the sacredness of these requirements? They were not formulated, after thorough study and hard thinking, by a conclave of serious and representative educators. They are not even a frequently revised product of continued trial and error. In most states they represent a compromise, made by "experts" of the type I have described, between various political, economic, and educational interests. They can be called a narrowing down from pressure group to pressure group. I applaud the conclusion of the American Council report that:

In general, there is no scientific basis for teacher certification requirements. There is, therefore, great confusion and much disagreement as to the validity of present certification practices. Such a situation constitutes more than a deficiency. It is a serious indictment against our entire program of teacher education.

Here is work for us to do. We cannot much longer evade the responsibility. There must be a formulation of the proper requirements for teacher certification, providing sufficient flexibility, and based upon some acceptable and reasonable educational philosophy, and operated upon some valid scientific basis. Until that is done, we shall continue to writhe in red tape and fulminate amid chaos.

The longer action is postponed, the more difficult the task. We must not postpone action by requests for more surveys and statistical reports. There are plenty of studies available to provide the facts. What is needed is more cerebration, cooperation, and courage. The main trouble with teacher education and hence with school education is clear: it is not good enough. It is not good enough because in general teachers are not good enough. Both situations can be corrected if more young people of high intellectual and personal qualifications would elect school work as a career. They do not do so because they sense the mediocrity of the present system and react from its inflexible requirements. Why not take the obvious steps to do something about it?

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ECONOMICS, AND PROGRESS*

HAROLD G. MOULTON

PRESIDENT, THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

THE very broad title chosen for this evening's discussion—"Science, Technology, Economics, and Progress"—was not, as you may perhaps have inferred, selected with a view to giving sufficient scope in which to adumbrate a new philosophy of the cosmos. Rather it was dictated by fear—fear that if I undertook to discuss any one of these subjects—other than economics—in any considerable detail I would soon get beyond my depth; and that if I entered upon any elaboration of the principles of economics you would soon be beyond your depth. So I have chosen a subject which will permit us to roam intellectually together—moving both *horizontally* across the fields that have been outlined, and *vertically* between the "Golden Middle Ages" and the present era of discontent. I shall be satisfied if I succeed in contributing something toward a better understanding of the interrelations of science, technology, and economic organization in the service of society.

If we were to let the span of human history be represented on the face of a clock, the period elapsing up to the last two centuries would be roughly the equivalent of the time from noon to ten minutes before twelve midnight. The last ten minutes would represent the period during which science, engineering, and the system of free business enterprise have been dominant. Economic progress during these last ten minutes has greatly exceeded that of the preceding 710 minutes. The standards of living of the masses today, notwithstanding an extraordinary increase in population, are higher than those of the classes of former times.

The great economic maladjustments and problems which have frustrated our activities and perplexed our thinking in recent years have led many people to conclude that we have had too much scientific development and too much economic progress. Instead of a world in which scientific discoveries and their applications through technology to the processes of wealth production are regarded as

* Address before the Phi Beta Kappa Alumni of New York City, May 24, 1938.

the royal road to progress, we now find science and engineering being made responsible in no small degree for our economic difficulties.

As a means of posing the problem before us, let me present two widely contrasting statements with respect to the significance of science at the present time.

Science as fundamental knowledge has been the greatest factor in freeing our minds from the preconceptions and superstitions handed down to us through the ages. Our mental attitude has been profoundly modified by our knowledge of the processes of evolution. . . . Knowledge not only helps to set us free, but will lead us on to higher things. . . . The applications of scientific knowledge have made possible a standard of living undreamed of a generation ago. . . . Our greatest hope for future well-being and prosperity lies in further applications of science.¹

The enormous advance gained by the sciences of inanimate matter over those of living things is one of the greatest catastrophes ever suffered by humanity. The environment born of our intelligence and our inventions is adjusted neither to our stature nor to our shape. We are unhappy. We degenerate morally and mentally. The groups and the nations in which industrial civilization has attained its highest development are precisely those which are becoming weaker. And whose return to barbarism is the most rapid. But they do not realize it. They are without protection against the hostile surroundings that science has built about them.²

In what concrete ways is science held to be a menace—a threat to the future of civilization? At its door various commentators, reflecting upon the undisciplined progress of the past one hundred years, have placed responsibility: for developing an industrial organization of such vast complexity as to baffle human control; for creating an international economic structure in a world of political nationalism; for building implements of warfare which threaten the very extinction of peoples; for so mechanizing work processes as to dull the qualities of human intelligence; for changing the relative rates of population growth in the upper and the lower strata of society; for bringing into existence new forms of goods and services in such rapid succession and in such profusion

¹ Irving Langmuir, in address on *Chemical Research*, at dedication of the new building of Mellon Institute, 1937.

² Alexis Carrel, *Man, the Unknown* (1936), p. 38.

as to make it difficult for slowly changing human beings to assimilate them; for giving us leisure that we do not know how to use; for producing chronic unemployment and the grave social problems which it entails; for building up a capacity for production beyond our powers of consumption; for creating an artificial way of life in place of the old simplicity; and for distorting ethical values and undermining religion and morals.

Meanwhile, the ambitions of science are not being realized; indeed, there is a deep feeling of frustration. Applications of new knowledge and inventions to productive processes are delayed by restrictive business practices and governmental regulations, and especially by great economic dislocations which thwart the profit incentive and at the same time diminish the financial resources required for continuing research.

THE MEANING OF SCIENCE

The term science is in some ways ambiguous and confusing. To some it merely connotes a field of study—"the natural sciences"; to others it means a particular method of analysis; and again it often suggests a body of exact principles of fixed and unchanging character. What we are really interested in here is the *scientific spirit*, which is an attitude of mind. As William James expressed it: "I have to forge every sentence in the teeth of irreducible and stubborn facts."

The objective, open-minded, scientific outlook need not of course be restricted to consideration of natural phenomena; it may and should pervade all other realms of investigation. Nor is there any single methodology or technique of scientific inquiry. There are as many different types of observation, experimentation, and analysis as there are divisions of science; indeed, within the same field more than one technique may be employed, and even a single research project may require the utilization of a combination of processes. Galileo, Newton, Franklin, Darwin, Pasteur, Edison, Pavlov, Mill, and Curie employed widely differing methods of observation and analysis in arriving at their generalizations. They were alike only in the common purpose of deriving their conclusions from facts.

It should also be observed here that the conception of science as a body of exact knowledge, embodying principles and laws of

eternal verity, has in recent times undergone profound modification. The human mind, or rather spirit, longs for certainty; and it was the hope that as the proclaimed doctrines of the authoritarian age were overthrown the advance of science would unfold the laws of nature and reveal for our contemplation and satisfaction the ultimate truths of the cosmos. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries scientific writers in every field—in economics and law and government as well as in the realm of natural phenomena—sought to systematize and crystallize knowledge in a body of fixed principles.

But it has been found necessary as the years have passed, and especially in the last few decades, to qualify our former generalizations in the light of new knowledge and conceptions and also in the light of organic changes in the phenomena under investigation. This last consideration is of course especially the case in the social fields where institutions and processes have recently been undergoing rapid evolution. Nothing altogether endures; even mathematical analysis has undergone profound modification in the last half century. As summarized by Whitehead:

The progress of science has now reached a turning point. The stable foundations of physics have broken up. . . . The old foundations of scientific thought are becoming unintelligible. Time, space, matter, material, ether, electricity, mechanism, organism, configuration, structure, pattern, function, all require reinterpretation.³

A state of flux in scientific thought is disturbing to some minds; to others it only serves to open anew and more widely the avenues of intellectual adventure and to stimulate the quest for yet more knowledge, as well as for greater wisdom in its use. While the present age of disorganization and doubt calls for reexamination of basic tendencies and relationships and a broader orientation of our thinking, it has no place for discouragement with respect to science. On the contrary, the challenge to imaginative and unfettered minds was never so great as now.

Rapid change is commonly viewed with profound concern, even by distinguished students of social trends. We fear not only the unknown road that opens before us, but we distrust the capacities of individuals for adjustment to a changing environment; we envisage the destruction of old ideas with nothing adequate to

³ *Science and the Modern World*, p. 24.

take their place, and we foresee the disintegration of the primary virtues on which our lives have been built—which make us what we are today.

SCIENTIFIC FOUNDATIONS OF THE MODERN SOCIAL SYSTEM

The system of free enterprise under which the vast economic expansion of the past one hundred years or so has occurred has often been extolled. But there is little realization of the part played by science in laying the foundations of this system. Again, the influence upon man's productive power of the application of scientific discoveries to industry has repeatedly been emphasized; but relatively little has been said about the reciprocal importance of social institutions in promoting scientific advancement. A brief recapitulation of the mutual interactions of scientific and social developments over the past few centuries may thus prove a useful background against which to project our thinking with respect to the present and the future.

In the Middle Ages, to go no further back, men's thoughts were largely determined by higher authority. They were not supposed to question *why*, but only to *believe*. Similarly, under the economic organization known as the Feudal System men's productive activities were directed from above, with the individual possessing virtually no freedom of choice. Even after feudalism disintegrated in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, a centralized control of economic life was continued under the city states and the emerging national governments which followed. Even under the so-called mercantilist system of the eighteenth century business enterprise remained so hedged about by governmental controls that little opportunity was afforded for the exercise of individual initiative. It appears clearly to have been the influence of the great scientific discoveries of the seventeenth century which in due course provided the philosophical foundations for the system of free private enterprise.

The key to the great transition from regulated to free enterprise was found in the conception of "*nature's laws*" with which the physical scientists were concerned. What about the human being? Was he not a part of the natural order of things and if so could he possibly realize his potentialities if his life were circumscribed by man-made restrictions which curbed his free-

born spirit? The writings of Blackstone, Rousseau, Adam Smith, and others who formulated the principles of the common law, the laws of economics, the principles of government, and the science of sociology are permeated with the conception of natural law. And Jefferson, it may also be recalled, prefaced the Declaration of Independence with an all-embracing reference to the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle us. These men, drawing their inspiration from the great scientific discoveries of the preceding century, sought to apply the new found knowledge and conceptions to social organization—to invent legal, economic, and political institutions in harmony with the universe of nature. The three remarkable events of the years 1775-76—the application of the steam engine to industry, the publication of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, and the writing of the American Declaration of Independence—were not mere coincidence.

The immediate consequence of the writings of the social philosophers of the eighteenth century was the establishment of the system of free business enterprise which characterized the nineteenth century. First, innumerable laws which restricted the freedom and initiative of the individual were repealed. Second, industry and trade were relieved from a multitude of hampering regulations. Third, national boundaries came largely to be ignored through the removal of barriers and restrictions against the free international movement of trade and currency, and against the migration of people from country to country. There was born the conception of a world society, in which men should not only be free to develop their individual capacities to the utmost but also to live in whatever spot on the globe they desired and to conduct their business operations without reference to any national boundaries.

This system of free enterprise not only gave direct encouragement to the application of scientific discoveries to the production of wealth, but the expanding scope of business organization made it possible to utilize such discoveries with great effectiveness. In turn, the growth of wealth provided the means essential to the systematic conduct of large scale scientific research. Thus through action and interaction science and social organization have made possible—for good or for ill—the highly productive but complex and baffling civilization of our time.

ECONOMICS: THE DISMAL SCIENCE

The economic principles that were formulated by early nineteenth century economists were so sombre in their implications that economics was long referred to as the dismal science. This phrase did not arise, as many have assumed, out of the difficulty or dreariness inherent in economic analysis; it reflected merely the drab outlook for humankind on a planet characterized by the niggardliness of nature. As a setting for the discussion of the great contributions of science to the processes of wealth production during the course of the last century, it will perhaps be useful to summarize very briefly the fundamental conclusions reached with respect to human progress by the earlier writers on political economy.

These scholars concluded that the economic condition of the masses of the people at any given age and the degree of economic progress that might occur with the passage of time were controlled or limited by three fundamental factors: (1) the land or other resources provided by nature; (2) the accumulation of capital, that is, tools, machinery, factories, etc.; and (3) the labor supply. Two of these factors were regarded, so far as expansion was concerned, as subject to severe limitations, while the third—the labor supply—was subject to a geometric rate of growth which tended to defeat, so far as standards of living were concerned, whatever gains might come from the improvement in the other factors.

While new agricultural areas might be opened to settlement and new mineral, forest, or aquatic resources might be discovered, there were clearly ultimate limits to these resources. Moreover, the fundamentally important land resources were very definitely limited from the point of view of quality. The most fertile areas were in the main those first utilized and, as population grew, resort would have to be had to poorer and poorer land. While improved methods of land utilization might serve to increase productivity, such increase was subject to the law of diminishing returns.

The supply of capital was limited by factors of a different type. In brief, its increase involved a choice between the *immediate* satisfactions that might be realized by devoting all our energy to the production of consumer goods and the larger satisfactions that might *ultimately* be realized if some of our resources were currently devoted to the production of capital goods in order to

increase our future productive capacity. The growth of capital thus depended upon the ability and the willingness of individuals to make present sacrifices for the sake of future gains. Inasmuch as the great majority of human beings possessed the most meagre standards of living and were, moreover, regarded as lacking in foresight, the rate at which capital would be created did not appear likely to be rapid. Moreover, if capital should perchance for a time be increased with exceptional rapidity, its use in conjunction with limited natural resources would inevitably result in a decrease in its marginal productivity. Hence its interest yield would decline—thus checking the tendency to further accumulation.

The labor supply, on the other hand, was subject to no such limitations. On the contrary, as a result of natural instincts, it tended inevitably to increase out of all proportion to the other factors of production. Hence population growth would necessitate the continuous resort to poorer resources, thereby tending to reduce living standards to the minimum of subsistence. While wars and pestilences might serve at times to improve the balance among the factors of production, there appeared little hope for progressively rising standards of living—unless perchance “prudential restraint” might eventually serve to control the birth rate.

It was the geometric rate of population growth as compared with the arithmetic rate of growth of the other factors which not only gave to the science of economics its awesome appellation, but also foreshadowed a grim future for the human race. Moreover, the conditions of life in China, India, and other old civilizations afforded striking illustration of the permanent tendency for population growth to exceed that of other resources; indeed, the very redundancy of the labor supply served as an effective deterrent to technological developments which might economize human labor.

Today, as everyone realizes, the situation is profoundly different from that which was contemplated by the observers of the early nineteenth century. In a large part of the world the standards of living have been enormously increased and the dire results of the laws formulated by our economic forefathers appear somehow to have been avoided. Instead of a conception of all-controlling scarcity, we are troubled with conceptions of abundance; indeed, before the eyes of many is the spectre of superabundance.

TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIAL DISASTER

Since the very beginning of scientific discovery and invention men have feared and opposed the use of new productive instruments. Always we find concern expressed not only over the effects upon employment but also upon public health and social standards. As a rule, moreover, it would seem that our basic ideals and morals are about to be undermined.

You are all familiar with the destruction of farm machinery in our early history and with the hostility to the introduction of the factory system in England; but perhaps you do not recall the profound concern of Queen Elizabeth over a new contrivance for the spinning of yarn. I am sure you recall that the automobile was a menace alike to the carriage business, to the bicycle, and to the Iron Horse, as well as to civilization; and that the railroad engine in its early days was opposed because it destroyed employment on the stagecoach and the canal boat, while its noxious gases threatened to undermine public health, and kill the birds of the air, the raucous noises meanwhile frightening to death the flocks of the field. But you perhaps did not realize that quite as great a furor was occasioned by the introduction of the stagecoach, which not only threatened the saddle industry and all its related employments and reduced the government revenues collected from horseback riders at public inns, but also threatened to undermine the health and morality of society. I quote a brief paragraph from a book published in 1673 under the title *The Grand Concern of England*.

Travelling in these Coaches can neither prove advantageous to Men's Health or Business: For, what advantage is it to men's Health, to be called out of their Beds into these Coaches, an hour before day in the morning, to be hurried in them from place to place, till one hour, two, or three within night; insomuch that after sitting all day in the Summer time stifled with heat, and choked with dust; or the Winter time starving and freezing with the cold, or choked with filthy Fogs, they are often brought into their Inns by Torchlight, when it is too late to sit up to get a Supper; and next morning they are forced into the Coach so early, that they can get no Breakfast. What addition is this to men's Health or Business, to ride all day with strangers, oftentimes sick, ancient, diseased Persons or Young Children crying. . . . Is it for a Man's Health to travel with tired Jades. . . .

For passage to London being so easie, Gentlemen come to London oftner than they need, and their Ladies either with them, or having the Conveniences of these Coaches, quickly follow them. And when they are there, they must be in the Mode, have all the new Fashions, buy all their Cloaths there and go to Plays, Balls and Treats, where they get such a habit of Jollity, and a love to Gayety and Pleasure, that nothing afterwards in the Countrey will serve them.

Just to make the historical picture complete, one may set beside this quotation a recent statement of Professor Hooton of Harvard with respect to the ultimate consequences of automobile and air transport upon the human being himself:

The once erectly striding biped abandons human locomotion and whizzes through the landscape crouched over wheels and levers worked by his still prehensile hands, and his flat, vestigial feet, no less useful for *this* purpose than those of his Simian ancestors.

Whatever may have been the social and moral consequences of technological developments, aggregate employment has been enormously increased. In due course those displaced in particular industries or in given jobs have succeeded in finding employment elsewhere. During modern times the total population has increased much more rapidly than ever before, yet all have found employment. Meanwhile, in the brief time that has elapsed since the industrial revolution, standards of living have been raised more than in all preceding history. These are the concrete results of scientific discovery and their application to the processes of wealth production.

In times of prosperity we usually hear relatively little about technological unemployment. This is for the obvious reason that at such times it is relatively easy to find employment elsewhere. Nevertheless even at such times the problem is a very real one for the particular individuals who are displaced. Studies which have been made covering the period of the twenties indicate a considerable lag in the finding of new work and they show also that the new jobs may often be less remunerative than those formerly held. Looking at the problem from a broad, social point of view, however, such difficulties have to be regarded as a part of the growing pains of progress. Society, of course, has an obligation to care for those who are displaced and to facilitate in every way possible their re-employment.

ARE WE AT THE END OF THE ROAD?

The view that the applications of science to industry have already given us a productive capacity—or at least productive potentialities—ample for all our needs has been widely held in recent years; and it has exerted a profound influence upon public policy both in the United States and other countries.

What are the facts with respect to productive capacity? In 1929, the year of our greatest production, the total national income—which represents the value of the goods and services produced—was about 81 billion dollars. This is the equivalent of about \$660 per capita, or \$2,600 per family. Since income was not equally distributed, the great majority of families received very much smaller incomes than this average. Indeed, 12 million families, or 42 per cent of the total number, had incomes of less than \$1,500; and 60 per cent of the families had less than \$2,000. At 1929 prices a family income of \$2,000 was sufficient to supply little more than the basic necessities required for health and efficiency; generally speaking, it provided no margin for comforts and luxuries of life. Budgetary studies indicate that the provision of “reasonable standards of living” would require an income nearly double that enjoyed by the masses of the American people in the year of our greatest production.

We were not, however, making full use of our existing productive facilities. The comprehensive investigation of America’s productive capacity recently made by the Brookings Institution⁴ indicated that we might have produced in 1929 something like 20 per cent more than we did produce. It is true, to be sure, that much scientific knowledge then available remained to be translated into actual purchasing power. Hence our *potential* productive capacity was somewhat greater than these estimates would indicate.

In the years which have elapsed since 1929 there has been an actual curtailment of national productive capacity, while at the same time we have had a further increase of population of more than 6 per cent. Per capita production in 1937 was only about 85 per cent as great as in 1929. The reduction in productive capacity during the course of the depression years is simply the result of our failure to make good the actual deterioration of plant

⁴ *America’s Capacity to Produce*, published by the Brookings Institution.

and equipment that has occurred. Careful study indicates⁵ that in the field of capital and other durable goods production must be expanded approximately 60 per cent annually over the next five years if we are to overcome the results of seven years of sub-normal replacement and also to create new capital goods in proportion to the growth of population. A depression has relatively little effect upon the rate of population growth; but it has a profound effect upon the rate of capital growth. The real economic costs of a great depression are registered in these fundamental relationships.

The realization of the standards of living to which we aspire thus clearly lies in the distant future. It is easy to overestimate the rate at which new scientific discoveries and new developments in the field of industry yield their fruits in higher standards of living. In the unparalleled era of American expansion between 1900 and 1929 the per capita production of the American people was increased less than 40 per cent. Great Britain's golden nineteenth century, which covered the period from the beginning of the industrial revolution to the height of England's industrial supremacy, showed only a fourfold rise in living standards.

The meaning of these facts for our present purposes is simply that, rather than being near the end of the highway of progress, many leagues of dusty travel remain before us. We shall require all the aid which science can render for decades yet to come before we need seriously worry about the problems of life in an age of plenty. Meanwhile, the great necessity is to make science and economic organization work with increasing effectiveness in the service of society.

⁵ *The Recovery Problem in the United States*, published by the Brookings Institution.

REFLECTION AND THE ACTIVE LIFE*

GORDON K. CHALMERS
PRESIDENT, KENTON COLLEGE

THE outward deeds of the world have largely been done by unreflective men. The king has called in his sages, the prime minister his civil servants, and the governor or president his brain trust. He calls them in, but in a crisis he may proceed regardless of their advice, for it is his business to succeed; the thinker's, simply to be right. A fraction of the time the result has been workable, but not often can you call it thoughtful. Hardly a social, religious, or political change has enjoyed the approval of the thinkers. Priests and philosophers scold the rulers for this, and to mend matters all the best teachers have strained their wits to bring the two functions of human life together—action and thought. Their problem has been as profound and as difficult as squaring the circle, and to date about as unsolvable. But our failure to square the circle by Euclid's system defeats merely our intellectual ambition; the failure to wed thought and action defeats our purpose to survive as men.

Here we stand, legatees of six thousand years of learning, confronted with the same intractable, reluctant human nature. Some are actors, some thinkers. It is as if the cells of some were round, of others, slipper-shaped.

And yet no teacher worthy the name will ever give up the ancient try. The doer must be made a thinker, too; and if not altogether, then as much as possible. We sometimes hear it said that professional thinkers should go into politics, business, and places of management. While this may be a good thing, our modern life is so precarious that we can ill afford the risk of inviting them generally to take the reins. Our real need is for men of action who by habit are reflective. True, even such men, compared with heroes of action, have fallen short of the conventional standard of heroism. Marcus Aurelius is an example; perhaps Hannibal, and Lawrence of Arabia. A few like President Lincoln provide the pattern, and therefore "belong to the ages." Schooled from early youth in the ways of inquiry, when Lincoln was called upon for action, he asked questions of the facts

* Inaugural address delivered Oct. 23, 1937.

themselves with which he was confronted; and his deeds were reflective, as the peculiar brilliance of his fame attests. Only such men as he, used to coincidental action and reflective thought, are strong enough to apply to our social life the vision without which the people perish.

Active men must learn to reflect both because they alone can qualify with reasonableness our commerce and politics and also because unreflective men of action make life dull. Dullness is a more festering evil than we with our Puritan and Scottish heritage admit. The old Scots of two generations ago said the following rhyme:

We can't for a certainty tell
What mirth will befall us on Monday;
So at least to begin the week well
We'll all be unhappy on Sunday.

The just place of reflection in our century has been preempted by fatigue. The tired business man or the tired professional man is often a brainy man, but his managerial job is exacting; exhaustion of nerve and mind are its price. When he spends himself on one more project of efficiency, expansion, promotion, and management, however, we are sentimentalists if we pity him because the maelstrom sucks him down. Perhaps he pities himself over his cigar while resting at a country inn and says he envies the artist fellow or the poet chap who has time to "think the thoughts he loves the best." But evidently his envy is a romantic one, for on his own job he believes more certainly in managership than anything else he might do.

The preacher and the social reformer may accuse this man of greed or lusting after power. True, the *libido habendi* and the *libido dominandi* are strong amongst us, but I do not think they finally describe our well-intentioned, right-thinking man of action who is eager to give his children opportunities and to see his community prosper. Why, then, do we as a people habitually "let the things we care for least stand in the way of the things we care for most?" I think it is because most men of action are familiar with the certain benefits of good management and out of ignorance are plainly skeptical about the worth of anything else. The tired professional or business man who envies the artist fellow nine times in ten doesn't know what he is sighing for. If you doubt

this, read carefully any one of the magazines prepared for weary men of action and notice the allusions to painting, music, poetry, physical science, and the science of ideas. If you happen to know any one of these fairly well, you will observe that the references to it on the whole are stereotypes, conventional, and ignorant, showing little connection with the thing itself. A man cannot turn his own hours to reflection if he neither knows what reflection is nor has learned how to pursue it.

The small desultory dullness of modern life is a misfortune; the philosophy which it inspires is nothing less than nationally fateful. Our very ideas of nobility have become circumscribed: "Theirs not to reason why, theirs but to do and die." What pathetic creatures we make ourselves! Indeed, how tragic the destiny we invite! The late George Eastman, accomplished organizer and administrator, philanthropist and patron of the arts, could only say of his life, before he died by his own hand, that it was all obligations and responsibilities.

And yet, the life of the man of action need not be dull at all—need not be dull to the spirit, and ashes in the mouth. On the contrary. Some men trained early in the ways of reflection have done their share of the world's humble work and at the same time have cultivated ideas of the arts beyond the limits of mere hobbies. Even in the philistine age of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries this has been done, and what is more, it has been done in the manager countries of the world, England and America, where thought, reflective thought, not as a means to better management, but for what it is worth directly to the mind, is popularly ignored or suspect. Walter Bagehot succeeded in doing this. He operated ships and carried on a banking business, yet he found time more than to enjoy philosophy and literature, as his many books of warm, readable criticism attest. Kenneth Grahame, also an English banker, was another. His bewitching books of animal fantasy which hold a mirror up to human nature illumine our own leisure hours as they did his. Benjamin Disraeli, the British Prime Minister, and Sir William Osler, the Canadian doctor, showed in their active and reflective lives the same rewarding union of these two sides of our nature. In our country, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes was such a man. Sometimes his reflections on learning and human life were extensive, like his father's essays, sometimes they were cryptic. Mr. Justice Day was "a

wisp of a man." His son, a former football player and a six-footer, argued a case before his father and the other members of the Supreme Court. Justice Holmes measured with his eye the massive scion of his associate and scribbled a note which was passed along the nine chairs: "He's a block off the old chip."

Among contemporaries there is the Governor-general of Canada, a popular historian and novelist; and also the Governor of Connecticut, editor of our strongest quarterly. The works of none of these men are classic. They fall just short of the absolute first rank in history, philosophy, literature, and criticism. Yet they are strong, manly, reflective books, read and enjoyed by the specialist as well as the layman.

No, the lives of men of action need not be dull. Not only is this true for men of rare talents and titanic endurance; it may be true for ordinary men. They, also, may cultivate and make their own the things we really hold precious, the subtle values of perception, taste, and nourishing ideas.

Yet in America, the man of affairs who tries to make these riches truly his own is commonly frustrated. The closest he comes to living is to collect or manage something, not in the full sense to possess and enjoy it. If he collects pictures but does not understand them, they might just as well be door-knobs. If he hires a bibliographer to buy his books the chances are that he attains only a limited possession—in the hand or on the shelf, not in the mind. He may turn to music, and again he is inhibited—forbidden the promised land. Not having learned music in his youth, but eager to be useful, he finds he can at least help support the orchestra by managing its accounts; so from managing his business by day he comes home to manage another business by night. A valuable enterprise for the community, and rewarding to him, perhaps, in terms of the gratitude of his neighbors, but the whole worrisome business brings him little closer than the mere number and fame of the symphony to nourishing himself with the joy-giving music he sought.

Gertrude Stein, that odd reflective genius, part showman and part wit, returned to her native United States after a long absence and engaged in argument some of the men responsible for a renaissance of reasoning in one of the universities. I quote from her unpunctuated, swift, circular sentences which appeared in the October *Atlantic*. Her hosts, she said,

were having special classes and in them they were talking over all the ideas that had been important in the world's history. Every week they took a new idea and the man who had written it and the class read it and then they had a conversation about it.

What are the ideas that are important I asked [the director]. Here said he is the list of them I took the list and looked it over. Ah I said I notice that none of the books read at any time were originally written in English, was that intentional I asked him. No he said but in English there have really been no ideas expressed.

Then I gather that to you there are no ideas which are not sociological or governmental ideas. Well are there he said, well yes I said. Government is the least interesting thing in human life, creation and the expression of that creation is a damn sight more interesting, yes I know and I began to get excited yes I know, naturally you are teachers and teaching is your occupation and naturally what you call ideas are easy to teach and so you are convinced that they are the only ideas but the real ideas are not the relation of human beings as groups but a human being to himself inside him and that is an idea that is more interesting than humanity in groups, after all the minute that there are a lot of them they do not do it for themselves but somebody does it for them and that is a darn sight less interesting. Then Adler began and I have forgotten what the detail of it was but we were saying violent things to each other and I was telling him that anybody could tell by looking that he was a man who would be singularly unsusceptible to ideas that are created within oneself that he would take to either inside or outside regulation but not to creation.

It is true that the American universities have offered to teach action, and the result is economics, politics, and social science, little else.

So the nervous energy and the brain energy of men and women may be turned, day after day of all the three-score years and ten allotted, upon the absorbing problems of management. National politics, international politics—housekeeping at home and overseas. Don't let me be misunderstood. National and international housekeeping are of incalculable importance, as we can learn by the bitter headlines almost any morning. They are not, however, the most important thing of all. Indeed we see all over the occidental world and now in the oriental the horrid result of the belief that housekeeping worries can be isolated and resolved

exclusively in their own terms. No economic problem can be detached from politics, no political problem from philosophy, no philosophical problem from the arts, sciences, and finally religion. What happens to nations who try to violate this truth we may see on the shores of the Mediterranean and Yellow Seas; what happens within a nation we may observe in Moscow, and, one may fearfully inquire, at what other capitals of the world?

Danger arises when the active life of the world is thoughtless and also when the lives of men of action are dull. Yet we have noticed that some men have earned for themselves the great reward of reflection even though engaged, the while, in affairs, and that such blessings are possible among average as well as great men.

I am afraid we must admit, however, that they are more common in England and Scotland than in America. There is no census of this sort of thing, and one must go by impressions. But one expects rather as the usual thing in England to find a busy person, a retired army officer, or a man engaged in buying or selling in the city, who has followed with eagerness some scientific or historical or literary problem and become its master. You may read his modest articles in the small magazines, which are published as much for the mutual pleasure of the contributors as for the general public. To be sure his output is not important, scientifically speaking, but where such men characterize the community, the arid and material philosophy of the mere doer is met by the beliefs of those who can draw out of experience something abiding for themselves; "life more abundantly" becomes a reality when they have been the sowers and tenders of the crop.

Philosophers and educators generally are ready to admit that we need active men familiar with the reflective life, and of late years they have made two earnest attempts to supply the thoughtfulness which as a people we lack. One is Adult Education; the other is called The New Education.

Useful as Adult Education may be in many ways, it cannot meet the issue of reflection; for adult years are too late for acquiring it. Reflection is a habit learned early, even in childhood, and, if of any use at all, cultivated and made strong through all the years of growth. If it is not apprehended then, either through some personal awakening or through good teachers, it is hardly to be won at any time afterwards.

The New Education believes that it matters little what the student thinks about, so long as he uses his wits. Consequently the New Educators devote their attention to the student's whimsies, his desires and interests (magic word) in order to get him to discuss things. How eagerly he will discuss. I have known him standing in giant ignorance, not aloof, but in squads, to offer to discuss geometry at the first meeting of the geometry class before he knew what geometry is.

True the New Education has achieved many things. For one, it has brightened learning in the early years and made it less severe. Also, it has presented studies to the student in terms of the use he will make of them, and in so far as the use considered is use to the mind, the principle is valid. But as a philosophy the New Education has committed the very fault of un-reflection which all good teaching tries to correct. A favorite phrase of the new movement is "Education for the Future." By this is meant mastering the tricks, manners, and what is called the technique of the probable way of doing things in the 1950's and 1960's. Much attention is paid to the passing habits of social organization. "Prepare them to live in the world of the future," they say. Well, essentially what is the modern world and what will it ever be, no matter how many airplanes we have or of what new design, but a world of men and women doing their best to get along and to find for themselves at least small comforts of the spirit in this earthly pilgrimage? First of all, the ancient and abiding nature of the world must be understood and its physical setting in air, earth, fire, and water. Kenyon College, with its airport, its international relations club, its laboratory equipment, its journalistic, economic, and political interests, cannot be called blind to the contemporary scene. But no one should pretend that anything short of the sharpest and most analytical understanding of man's human as well as physical make-up is the true preparation for life in the 1950's and 60's, regardless of how nations and cities or even stars may then be organized, and what communications may be effected between them.

The net result of the New Education may largely be described as wit-sharpening rather than instruction in reflection, for it neglects human experience. The student is quickened, but how little of value he learns. We boast of the aplomb of American students. When compared with those of Europe, they seem to

"know their way about." By this we mean that they shake hands with strangers, master the subway system, and handle the baggage agent like grown-ups. But turn a group of American and European students loose in a painting gallery. For fairness pick a modern gallery new to them all, and observe which students bring to the pictures the knowledge and critical judgment which gives their visit meaning. Most of these will be Europeans. Hesitant and shy as European young people may be on the surface, they are usually schooled according to thorough habits of learning and reflection, and their maturity is maturity of the mind.

Adult studies cannot teach reflection because they come too late; the New Education fails to do so because it neglects experience. The traditional college of liberal arts, on the other hand (not, in the exact sense of those words, such a common institution these days as the newspapers would lead you to think) has proved itself able to instruct young people in reflection. To be worth its salt it must continue so to instruct them.

For clarity, let us look closely at what reflection is. The man who reflects discovers a new truth in an old and familiar one. Speeded up this process strikes off sparks of wit. A Detroit newspaper gave the following musical criticism: "An amateur string quartette played Brahms here last evening. Brahms lost." Walter Hard tells about men sitting around the stove in a country store in Vermont. They are talking about being licked in school. "I never was licked but once in my life," says one; "and that was for telling the truth." A voice from the edge of the circle says, "Well, Henry, it cured you."

Socrates said that the wise man is the one who asks the right questions of nature. Reflection upon physical nature enriches our lives daily, though it may not bring to us such brilliant results as those of Isaac Newton when he watched the apple fall, or Galileo when he timed with his pulse the swinging chandelier he saw in church. But an even more useful type of reflection for most of us is that upon human nature. This, from the level of critical wit to the parables of the sages, forms the basis of all good religion and morality and teaches us, as no handbook can do, how to get along with our fellows, or how to understand the arts.

So Keats, questioning how one would feel who had deserted her own folk and her gods, reversed the usual opinion about Ruth, the daughter-in-law of Naomi. We commonly picture her buoyant

in her loyalty, but Keats saw beyond this to the one who day by day would remember the land she had left:

Perhaps the self-same song that found a path
Through the sad heart of Ruth, when sick for home,
She stood in tears amid the alien corn.

This is legitimate reflection, not violating the accounts, for so Ruth may and indeed must have felt. Contrast the following, by Robert Wolfe, on Samson and Delilah:

Before their marriage, one had never known
Whether the man could settle down or not:
For instance, that wild tale of the jawbone,
And other rumors better left forgot.
His wife was wise, however, never stressed
Her private views too sharply; having shown
What she and all his friends considered best,
She let him strictly otherwise alone.
He never was betrayed—the simple truth
As all our best inscriptions prove, was this:
He seems at length to have realized how uncouth
Departure from good standards really is,
And trimmed his beard himself, and clipped his hair,
Because he envied their superior air.

Delightful as this is, genuine reflection is abused here, for the facts are abused. True reflection abides by what is known or given, even by the popular or epic tale, so that the imagination with which a man adds to what he finds keeps within the limits of what a certain person or chemical or bit of protoplasm or geometric equation might do. The real thinkers will never violate the facts, narrative, moral, or scientific.

It may interest you to know that one generally regarded as America's best living poet and perhaps the best American poet of all does not rise immediately on waking. While others do their setting-up exercises to the radio, for at least fifteen minutes he lies quiet, asking questions of nature or himself. He asks about almost anything and comes upon the answer sometimes in the form of another question, such as: Is Injustice the true opposite of Justice, or is Mercy? Or such as the following:

The heart can think of no devotion
Greater than being shore to ocean—
Holding the curve of one position,
Counting on endless repetition.

And by accurate reflection alone all our knowledge has in-

creased. The monk Mendel, with his tall peas and his short peas, put questions to the visible facts and perceived a new knowledge—the consistent habit of nature when live things reproduce. He found a fact which had been there all the time, yet for our purposes not there at all until he meditated on what he saw. Jakob Grimm thought about the aspirate and stop sounds in the Indo-European languages; Karl Verner, about the accents preceding these sounds. Mendel's law, Grimm's law, Verner's law. Shakespeare said in one of his sonnets, "The expense of spirit in a waste of shame is lust in action." That is the statement of a law, a human law. The statement might be called Shakespeare's law, perhaps, one of Shakespeare's laws. How magnificent is the lot of man! A small monk with his peas, a scholar with his words in the mouth and on the page, an actor writing down his findings about humanity, and by a little "taking thought" he is able to attach his poor finite name to a truth.

If the liberal arts college succeeds in teaching reflection as it should, it will become an even more attractive place than the New Education, by its indirect influence, has helped to make it. Already inviting to the young and eager mind, it can be made more pleasant still. The true rewards of study come to the upperclassman who is familiar enough with the rudiments of some one important subject to be able to think to himself quietly about it and beyond it—to mull it over. Senior general examinations, along with leisure and guidance to prepare for these, are designed to afford an opportunity to older students to turn their own thoughts in just such a way upon a small systematized body of knowledge.

Well learned and imaginatively thought upon, any of the central studies in the curriculum is the best gateway into liberal broadmindedness that a student can find. The student who nibbles here and nibbles there in his courses but chews no meat, goes away with many tastes but little nourishment. His reflections on a subject with which he is only slightly familiar are slight indeed. Let him narrow his attention in college so that in a small way he may master one important field. If he does, the chances are that as an alumnus he will continue to read, and then he will be ready to spread out his interests. The delights of the mind are mature delights, perhaps not mature in years, but certainly mature in intellectual experience. If a man attends to too many studies at once, his imagination is distracted from ever striking at the roots. Mere concentration by itself will not do the trick; but only

when a student has time to dwell with a subject can even an imaginative teacher lead him to reflect upon it.

A candidate for the Ph.D. comes up with a strong record in college—straight A's, and a reputation for exacting and steady work. What if confronted with a real thesis to write he proves able only to gather facts as a squirrel gathers nuts for storage, while all his hard work of collection brings even to himself no insight, no conclusion, no new understanding. A shame upon his college! He is not an A man but a dull man, and something should have been done long ago to teach him to reflect.

What better spot could there be for crowding into one's mind and habits the ways of fruitful thought—the hill thick with trees, its country quiet, and old stone walls with their ivy, a society of scholars and scientists?

That the college may be made an even more inviting place for the student than it is entails also making it a more inviting place for the professor. Like the tired lawyer or business man, the professor must be saved from the ills of fatigue which destroy reflection. He, too, can go dry unless he pursues his own thoughts and gives them opportunity to mix in "the deep well of unconscious cerebration." Let him have freedom from teaching and administrative duties sufficient to maintain and increase his own understanding; let him have the means to support this freedom. For the teacher in college is no propagandist who knows all the answers, but himself a student.

The thoughtful habit in life should provide a key to all our small as well as large plans in the college. Dormitory accommodations, places to eat and play—all must contribute to making it possible. Sports are invaluable not only in keeping men healthy but in providing the atmosphere of play and contests which makes extensive intellectual pursuits a joy. Student scientific explorations, like those of the faculty, must constantly be equipped. Not in the pedantic, but in the exciting sense, college should be a bookish place. The undergraduate at Paris, Oxford, or Cambridge enjoys extensive and cheap book-shops, and everyone gathers a library of his own. He acquires pictures and musical records that by his own reflection have come to mean something to him. My special wish for the undergraduates is that all through college they may be able to find privacy when needed, and that their hours spent by themselves may become increasingly delightful and rewarding.

The Episcopal Church with which Kenyon has always been affiliated, like the Greek and Roman Catholic, understands the ancient discovery that men's fruitful thought begins with a kind of brooding. *Ruminate* is the Latin word, meaning *chew the cud*. A man's own religious meditations may be started off by repetition of the mighty words of the Bible and the Prayer Book. It may be that often in saying them over we do not go beyond these words, but there is something informing to the spirit about their mighty march through the mind. In the Western World, many, nay, most of the true masters of reflection show in their own evolving thoughts the fruits of that sure discipline.

So it is with the rest of our golden heritage. The passages of history which reveal in some vivid way the true character of men, how near they are to the beast, or how magnanimous they may become, the accurate accounts set down by those who, like Leonardo, fearlessly have reported what with unwinking eyes they saw, the analyses of the dramatist, the assertions of the philosopher—all these lie rich and available to the mind of the reflective man. When he needs them, he draws them out, and like a zoologist staining a slide to show up special parts of the tissue he tries now a purple dye and now a dye of another color, looking at the matter this way, looking at it that way, until what he truly sees is more than what he started with.

This is our joy as thinking men. As men responsible for the work of the world, it is the light to our feet. I have said little of the fruits of inward action, those strenuous meditations which assert the final dignity of man and lead him to intimations of the Divine Grace. These reflections, like the humbler ones, qualify our active life, keep it sweet, and show us what deeds are poor and temporary, what are abiding. As active men we may share the same refreshment enjoyed by the thoughtful, given the priceless advantage of someone to show us early enough the ways of fruitful questioning. Let us seek these treasures for ourselves and our friends. Finally, let us covet for our country the presiding influence of many men who know how to reflect, one according to the discipline of a science, another according to the discipline of an art, so that what we do in this swift world will prove that while we prize good management, in fact we treasure even more the everlasting values of our human life.

POSSIBILITIES FOR IMPROVING ALUMNI RELATIONS

J. L. MORRILL

VICE PRESIDENT, OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

THE current academic year has already produced a considerable new crop of college presidents. It is important to observe the attitude of college presidents toward alumni, for this attitude may be institutionally symptomatic. It indicates in some cases whether the alumni interest and influence will be pruned back sharply, merely tolerated, or encouraged to thrive and flourish. At Dartmouth, for example, one type of ecology, measured by this index, seems to prevail; at Chicago, perhaps another.

"All alumni are dangerous," President Hutchins told an Oberlin commencement audience; and in his book on *The Higher Learning in America*, he declared the alumni "are interested in all the things that do not matter." But those of you who heard President Hopkins at the Amherst convention will remember a more thoughtful and heartening point of view. "The alumnus lives on what he feeds on," President Hopkins said. "If the honest attempt is made on the part of the college to consider the alumni as within the range of educational responsibility of the college, it will be found that the alumni can be, and desire to be, a helpful influence so far as the college is concerned."

Three presidential inaugurations were of special interest to me last fall, and the inaugural address in each case I read with close attention. The first was that of our own Dr. Levering Tyson, at Muhlenberg. The other two were those of Dr. Charles Seymour at Yale, and Dr. Edmund Ezra Day at Cornell. In none of them was there more than a casual allusion to the alumni.

With President Tyson the omission was not significant, because by faith and works he has long since proved the integrity of his commitment to a soundly organized and intelligently directed program of alumni activity. Yet it was a little disappointing—and aren't we daily reminded by newspaper advisers to the lovelorn that much marital unhappiness results from the failure of husbands to realize that wives require more than a taken-for-granted affection?

How ardently I envied the Cornell establishment in the early days of my own alumni work! There was an alumni secretary,

an alumni editor, and a fund-raising executive for the Cornellian Council—three capable men to handle the job that most of us must try to do alone. But the new Cornell president, except for casual commendation of Andrew D. White's original insistence upon alumni trustees, took no cognizance of Cornell's splendid alumni constituency.

Yale we honor as the principal pioneer in alumni financial support, with its class organization dating back nearly 150 years and with its powerful Alumni Fund setting the pattern for us all. The word "alumni" was used just twice in Dr. Seymour's admirable inaugural address, referring in neither instance to all that the alumni have meant to Yale through the years and can yet mean.

Some years ago the late Will Rogers visited our campus—and I was introduced to him as the alumni secretary. "The aloomni, eh," he said, a characteristic twinkle in his eye. "Well I always thought mebbe the colleges would git along better if they took most of the aloomni out the day after commencement and drowned 'em, like a batch of kittens." Perhaps if Rogers had lived he would be a college president today!

These things notwithstanding, it must be recognized that the colleges and universities of this continent have created the concept of alumni organization, loyalty and support—unique in the whole world history of higher education, indigenous to America in the Western world. They have developed that concept into a positive force in the social order—a powerful influence in the whole area of private philanthropy and a phenomenon well recognized in the arena of practical pressure politics. The alumni in America, as in no other land, have helped to build the institutions of higher learning—by their interest, their gifts and their organized sponsorship of state appropriations. All this Mr. Wilfred B. Shaw first brought to public attention through his article in *Scribner's Magazine* sixteen years ago. It was verified statistically in the Olmstead survey of "Alumni Achievements" in 1931 and in scores of other studies reported to this Council during its quarter-century of activity.

The points I should like now to suggest are these:

1. The inspiration, maintenance and development of alumni interest and support do not arise inherently from the nature of the educative process in itself. They have been

neither an aim nor a result of higher education in the world history of higher education. They have been by-products peculiar to the institutions of this country.

2. This being true, it is important to understand what influences have been specially favorable or unfavorable to "the incubation and nurture of alumni"—to discover whether they are still operative and effective as in the past, to appraise their value today, and to plan consciously for their encouragement or discouragement as a phase of the college program.

I have an idea we are taking too much for granted. This we must expect of the faculty. The proper care and feeding of infant-alumni is the job of the alumni secretary nowadays, not theirs. The faculty have been reminded, indeed, by an authority no less than the distinguished Dr. Abraham Flexner that "the university professor has an entirely objective responsibility—a responsibility to learning, to his subject, and not a psychological or parental responsibility for his students."

The typical present-day professor, even in the smallest colleges, is the product of highly specialized university training. His subject matter, rather than the student, is the center of his concern. The alumni, like the campus elms, he recognizes as useful and necessary embellishments of the academic scene when at commencement time, the football season or otherwise they come to his notice. But they are remote from his interests, there being no longer anything he can do with them. Even the older teachers—now that in most institutions the once desperate need for indispensable buildings and a salary schedule above bare subsistence has been met—are inclined to regard the alumni with an urbane attitude of somewhat affectionate but detached recollection.

"All generalizations are false, including this one," a wise and witty Frenchman once remarked. These professorial portraits do not describe wholly your faculty. Each one of you knows teachers who build into the lifelong consciousness of their students a sense of respect for, and loyalty to, the traditions and purposes of the school. But these are not the typical professors, I think you must agree. I am aware, of course, that the first criterion for faculty selection must be scholarly competence, not institutional evangelism. But I am trying to look objectively at

your problem, which is the incubation and nurture of alumni, and what helps or hinders its solution.

One hot summer night a good many years ago eight or nine of us alumni secretaries were talking shop, as invariably we will. We were wrestling with the perennial perplexity of why the great majority of alumni fail somehow to respond, why only a minority pay dues and take the magazine, why four whole years on the campus had seemingly failed to root in their minds and hearts an enduring attachment to the institution. We searched earnestly our own recollections and tried to canvass the kind of experience our present-day undergraduates were undergoing. And we came unanimously at length to the net conclusion that our presidents and faculties were the source of our stymie; that they were expecting us to accomplish with an army of absentees what they had failed conspicuously to achieve when they had this same army right in front of them, day after day for four whole years.

There was no faculty program, no explicit administrative objective for the incubation and nurture of alumni at the very time and the very place where the loyalty might best be developed. The work the alumni secretary must do was a kind of institutional after-thought.

More college presidents than not have come up from faculty ranks. Their unconcern about the problem is understandable. Besides, the alumni secretary is usually a capable, enthusiastic and useful member of the staff. Like the superintendent of buildings and grounds, he is efficient. At commencement time there are enjoyable reunions and fine parades. The alumni do give some money, and they have local club meetings all over the country with more speaking invitations to the president than he can find time to accept. He sees the glowing sunlit tip of the iceberg. Only the alumni secretary, in the clairvoyance of his more despondent moments, senses the chill of its huge and submerged segment.

I am not sure we can keep on taking for granted a good many things that used to be. Mr. Shaw, in that first *Scribner's* article reprinted in the *Manual of the American Alumni Council*, attributed the unique relationships of American alumni with their alma maters to two sides of the American genius—"its idealism, sentiment, if you will, and its ability for organization."

New times and trends have buffeted the idealism of an earlier day, and the mood of the undergraduate is not the same. Historically the American home helped to build the filial attitude. The decline of family influence is generally conceded in our industrial and urban environment. The breakdown of religious authority and moral certainty under what Mr. Walter Lippmann described as "the acids of modernity" we have not needed to look beyond our own campuses to observe. Postwar disillusionment, the defeatism of the depression, current cynicism and bad will in the controversies over the New Deal—these, too, have had corrosive effect upon impressionable college youth. It is possible they will affect in some degree the alumni attitudes of the immediate future.

To President Coffman's list of thirty-five national organizations pushing at the campus gates to proselyte youth, I suggest that we add the American Alumni Council as a thirty-sixth, working through the college itself from within. But this will be no group "against" anything. Here will be an organization genuinely interested in the education of young people and in the means of education. It will stand for what the colleges and universities themselves represent: the progressive training of youth in positive directions and the protection of academic integrity. We remember the Latin root of the word "alumnus"—the verb, "alere," to nourish—a word that must work in both directions: the nourishment by the college of alumni-to-be, and the nourishment of the college by alumni.

This latter the American Alumni Council, in a quarter-century of notable achievement, has intelligently undertaken and developed. It is the former—the nourishment by the college of the alumni-to-be—which we can no longer take for granted and for which we must more consciously contrive a program in which our administrations and faculties must be indispensably enlisted.

In these twenty-five years the Council can claim two notable accomplishments. The first is the progressive formulation and perfection of the techniques of alumni organization and support. This has been a big job, largely empirical over the years, but steadily sustained by an idealism and philosophy that have not succumbed to the specious and shoddy, John Tunis and his ilk to the contrary.

The second is the Council's enlightened and energetic sponsorship of the whole enterprise of "alumni education," so-called.

I do not appraise it so highly merely as an adjunct of the adult education movement in this country, although it is sufficiently significant as such. It seems to me vital because of the double challenge it presents—the challenge to the colleges to undertake a continuing commitment for educational inspiration and assistance to their alumni, and the challenge to the alumni to achieve a new kind of alumniship based on a continuing comradeship with their colleges in keeping on learning!

It is in that kind of relationship, I am convinced, that the alumni can most fully attain the right of real proprietorship in the present and future of their institutions. A proprietorship rooted only in the past and looking always backward may be rich in sentiment, helpful materially in money, and valuable in services of one kind and another. But it lacks something vital and self-starting and self-renewing. It does not give us insight and understanding as to the changing college or university of today, what it is thinking and doing—and it does not give us vision of what the college or university of tomorrow might be or ought to be.

As we come back to the campus to learn, or as the campus reaches out in the effort to help us accomplish, through knowledge and inspiration and encouragement, the things we need to know and do in our work, our leisure and our community activities, we alumni will have the chance to renew the intellectual enthusiasms that gripped us in college days and to know the thrill of new ones. The business of the college and university is learning, and in our own renaissance of learning, in whatever degree, we shall come to understand and appreciate the alma mater anew, and will know better how to serve her, which is the thing that as alumni we really want to do.

May we not launch the new quarter-century with a new challenge to our colleges? Cannot the American Alumni Council champion the cause of cultivating intelligent alumni attitudes in the crucial undergraduate years before commencement? How often it is the obvious that is overlooked! The project of post-collegiate education was not one the Council could itself undertake. Its contribution lay in making the colleges sensible of the need. So with "the incubation and nurture of alumni-to-be," we can aid only in awakening the awareness of our administrations and faculties to the need of a planned program with explicit techniques to reach an objective too much taken for granted.

The faculties will respond, generously and ingeniously, to leadership in this direction—just as they have responded with enthusiasm and effectiveness to the “alumni college” appeal. Much is now being done in many institutions—formally and informally. Most Freshman Week schedules provide sessions intended to create institutional understanding and pride, in some degree. There are courses for seniors in some colleges, like that at Dartmouth, designed to give the graduate a knowledge of the history and traditions and purposes of the college. The atmosphere of intercollegiate athletics is helpful, although there is little enough conscious coaching—and this is surprising—to build long-time loyalty. Undergraduate activities and organizations often aid, but in a superficial and undirected way.

The crying need is for an integrated campus program—one that is in the mind of the president and deans and on the mind of the teaching staff. The Council should survey, with characteristic thoroughness, every effort and device and technique on every American campus which might be used or adapted elsewhere. Each college should evaluate its own possibilities, appraise its own assets, initiate new approaches in terms of a consistent, co-ordinated and continuous agendum.

As he has always been, the teacher will be the agent of success or failure. Except through him no worth-while goal is ever reached. Growing academic emphasis on the individuation of instruction and curricula, and the rise of the personnel and guidance viewpoint in higher education will help to make faculties more malleable to our ends. Interest in the individual student is at the heart of the old liberal arts tradition, still the strongest historic influence in undergraduate education; and to the extent that it can be restored and enhanced by a new conversion of the faculty, the building of better alumni-to-be will be strengthened.

“Music,” Walt Whitman said, “is what awakens from you when you are reminded by the instruments.” Each listener will hear in proportion to the enrichment of his ear by previous study and appreciation. So, too, the sound of campus chimes or chapel bell—heard in alumni remembrance through the years—will evoke not only sentiment but significant response in proportion to the well-planned contribution of the college.

THE ACCEPTANCE OF FUNDS SUBJECT TO ANNUITY

A. A. WELLOCK

THE writing of annuity agreements involves the assumption of risks. These risks may be reduced by the adoption of an appropriate set of principles relating to the basic factors involved. It is the purpose of this paper to set forth a few of these principles.

An annuity agreement should be written in consideration of cash only. If an institution insists upon cash only, it is free to work out a suitable investment policy without the influence of its annuitants. If an institution accepts assets other than cash that are perfectly sound in themselves, it may find it difficult to bring itself to dispose of these assets if they fail to fit into its investment program. By accepting cash only an institution may diversify its investments according to its established policies. A college or university should be very reluctant to depart from this principle, but there may be occasions when it is advisable to make exceptions.

When specific assets other than cash are offered in consideration of an annuity agreement, they may sometimes be accepted at their *market value* if they are suitable to the purpose and fit into the institution's investment program for funds subject to annuity; otherwise the assets should be sold and an annuity agreement written for the net proceeds.

When real estate is offered in consideration of an annuity agreement, it may be accepted as a *living trust*, paying to the truster the actual net income from such property. It should further be agreed that the institution shall have the right to sell such property, and that when such property is sold, the institution will write an annuity agreement for the net proceeds received from the sale of such property at the rate paid to annuitants at the age of the donor at the time the sale of such property has been effected. Had a policy such as the foregoing been in effect a certain small college would not have had the experience described in the *Monroe County Appeal* on April 30, 1936. Let us read the account as it appeared in the paper. Names have been deleted.

College at _____ was unsuccessful in its effort to give a fine 400-acre farm away through the circuit court at _____. The case was called to trial Monday, with a strong array of legal talent on each side. College author-

ities, headed by President _____, had filed a petition in which it claimed to have lost about \$31,000 on the farm since acquiring it in 1922. It asked that the person from whom it had been acquired, Mrs. _____ of _____ be required to take the farm back and call the deal square. Mrs. _____ produced documents which showed that the college took title to the farm on an agreement to pay her \$3,600 as long as she lived. This agreement was carried out by the college until about a year ago when it defaulted in its payment and offered to deed the farm back to Mrs. _____. After the case was called for trial at _____, Monday, a compromise was reached by the terms of which the college will continue to operate the farm and Mrs. _____ will reduce its annual obligation to \$1,800, just half what it previously had been.

The annuitant was not obliged to accept this compromise agreement. She could have insisted upon the terms of her contract and the court would have upheld her. Even if the action of the college had been legal, there is doubt as to whether it could be considered ethical.

What effect the action of the college had on prospective annuitants or upon student loans, it is impossible to determine. It is reasonable to assume, however, that its action did not increase its prestige in the college community.

A few years ago a midwestern college president asked the author if he would accept a farm from a prospective annuitant in consideration of an annuity agreement. The answer was, "No." With a feeling of pride in his wisdom and astuteness, the president replied that he would and that he did. He went on to say that the annuitant was given a very liberal rate because he had cancer. Fortunately for the college the annuitant died before a year elapsed.

One cannot help but wonder what would have happened if the annuitant had not died so soon. Our large cancer research foundations are making real progress. What if this annuitant had been cured—a possibility even though an improbability? Would the college have gone to court and have asked to be relieved from its contract because the annuitant availed himself of the results of scientific research and recovered or prolonged his life rather than having died at middle age? This is a question filled with interesting possibilities.

When a college accepts funds subject to annuity, it must be willing and able to assume the risks incident thereto. It must be in a position to assume these risks without pledging its endowment funds or current income. If the college will adhere to the principles laid down in this paper, it will reduce the risks involved in the writing of annuity agreements.

To summarize: Annuity agreements should be written in consideration of cash only. Assets other than cash should be liquidated immediately and an annuity agreement written on the basis of the net proceeds.

COOPERATION FOR A UNIVERSITY THEATRE

NADINE MILES

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF DRAMA AND THEATRE,
WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

IN talking to the director of one of the country's outstanding little theatres last summer, I mentioned our productions of Milton's *Comus*, and of a modern adaptation of the *Miles Gloriosus* of Plautus.

"What did you do about the music for *Comus*?" he asked.

"Oh, the Music Department of the University supplied that," I replied.

"And where did you get the modernized script of *Miles Gloriosus*?"

"A member of the Classics Department has translated and adapted several Roman comedies which we have produced."

"Well, you see how lucky you are. We can't do productions like that in our theatre. We have only our regular acting and technical staffs to work with. You have all the various departments of an entire university to call on. Do you realize how fortunate you are?"

It is true that a drama department that has the cooperation of other departments of a university has an advantage in some ways over regular theatre organizations.

When we decided to produce the *Maske of Comus* in 1934, just three hundred years after the original performance, we first called the Department of Music and asked if they could fit the work involved into their schedule. They were greatly interested and promised to take charge of the musical part of the production. The date was set for November twenty-four, and rehearsals began late in September, just after the opening of the school year.

The English Department was enthusiastic in their support of the idea and gave us information about the texts of the play and valuable historical material about the original performance at Ludlow Castle.

The Cleveland School of Art recommended a student who designed the settings, costumes, and masks as part of his class work. When his designs were ready, several advanced students

of the Household Administration Department took complete charge of the costume work, from the dyeing of the materials to the final fittings. The scene designs were executed by Art School students and our regular technical staff. The papier maché animal masks for Comus' band were made under the direction of the designer by students in the dramatic arts classes. The Physical Education Department and a member of the Music Department designed and rehearsed the dances using students who had worked in special folk dancing classes.

Meantime rehearsals for the play proper were progressing. Casting was completed early from students in the dramatic arts classes of Mather and Adelbert Colleges. A major difficulty in casting was the impossibility of finding anyone who could both sing the songs and interpret the lines of Milton with the necessary style and finish. The singers had had no experience in the interpretation of poetry, and the actors could not sing. We decided to compromise and to use two people for the parts which required singing. At the performance the singers were off-stage, and when the time came for the character on the stage to sing, he simply stood motionless, while the singer, unseen in his position in the wings, took up the song. The audience accepted this artifice without question.

The orchestra rehearsals meanwhile were being conducted by Professor Arthur Shepherd, the head of the Department of Music, during the regular orchestra rehearsal period. We used the original music of Lawes and other contemporary composers. No orchestration was available, so Mr. Shepherd orchestrated the score for violins, cello, flutes, clarinet, horn, bassoon, trumpet, and harpsichord. Since there was no harpsichord in the city, we borrowed a very fine instrument from the Michigan State Normal Conservatory of Music, in Ypsilanti. The singers worked on the songs with their various voice teachers and also rehearsed with the orchestra.

Rehearsals for the play proper, for the dancing, and for the music, were carried on simultaneously in different rehearsal rooms until the final week, when the whole production was fitted together during the dress rehearsal period.

The production of a play of this kind requires careful planning by the departments involved. A large part of the work was done

either as special projects by students, for which they received credit, or in regular class time. Where the work was extra-curricular, it was done by students who were majoring in subjects related to the work and to whom the experience was of great practical value.

We have produced a number of plays involving the cooperation of various departments of the University. Each spring we send a play out for presentation in high-school assembly programs. This year the play chosen was a medieval German comedy, *The Wandering Student from Paradise* by Hans Sachs, the cobbling Meister-singer of Nuremberg. The German Department gave us the benefit of valuable research in the costuming and the acting style of the period. We have given two Roman comedies, translated and adapted by Professor Clarence P. Bill of the Classics Department. Professor Bill wrote the lyrics for a number of songs which were interspersed throughout the plays and these were set to music by students in the composition courses as part of their class work. Once we had difficulty in assembling an orchestra when saxophones were needed, for we discovered that saxophone players' time is bought up months in advance for Friday and Saturday night dances. We solved that problem by taking the orchestra to a recording studio and having records made of the music for the entire play. For the performance the actors sang their songs to the accompaniment of records played over the sound equipment system in our theatre. The only hardship they suffered was in catching up with the record when it occasionally skipped a groove.

The theatre has been called "the synthesis of the arts." Where all departments of a university cooperate, this ideal of the theatre can, in at least some measure, be realized.

TENURE IN NEW YORK CITY COLLEGES

ORDWAY TEAD

CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION,
NEW YORK CITY

IT should be pointed out that publicly supported colleges usually make definite provision for permanent tenure of employment of teachers during satisfactory service once a probationary period has been passed. This feature is less true of privately supported universities and colleges even though a presumption of tenure is tacitly acknowledged based on length of service or appointment to the higher professorial ranks.

Pursuant to this generally existing policy, our Board has by its new tenure by-law redefined and clarified the procedures by which the individual teacher achieves tenure. This provision was made necessary at this time because a recent court decision had shown the need of redefinition of rights and duties.

It is now provided that all teachers of instructorial rank or above who have served three years and been appointed to a fourth year shall acquire permanent status, subject to minor qualifications.

The establishment of tenure does, however, raise real problems as to the selection, advancement and stimulation of faculties from the point of view of continuing zeal, and teaching and scholarly effectiveness. It would be doubtful wisdom merely to grant tenure to qualified teachers without some modifying assurances that every effort will be made by them to continue to hold to high standards of professional competence.

Tenure does free the teacher from the threat of arbitrary dismissal which would impair the highly important freedom of speech and thought which the teacher should enjoy. Academic freedom was never more important to assure than today. Also, freedom from anxiety as to livelihood and security of income is desirable.

But these desirable ends must not be attained at the expense of loss of initiative, enthusiasm and quality in the conduct of the teaching enterprise itself.

Hence our Board has felt it essential to establish further pro-

visions which would help to assure that true scholarship and zeal are fostered within the faculties.

To this end we have, after prolonged study of college administration throughout the country and after extensive conferences with our own faculty representatives, passed an organization by-law. It is the purpose of these supplementary provisions to do two things: to assure that those who qualify for tenure shall be wisely chosen and consistently stimulated to their best; and to assure these aims by placing in the hands of the teachers themselves more direct responsibilities regarding selection and promotion of staff.

Unlike many colleges our voting faculties have not until now included instructors who have attained permanent tenure. From now on faculties will be bodies of scholars embracing all the qualified members of the teaching staffs. And through appropriate committee action they will join with the presidents in advising our Board regarding new appointments, reappointments, promotions and compensation matters—all in relation to budgetary ability.

The initiation of action on these matters is entrusted more largely than at present to the several teaching departments of the colleges. The new methods imply and require that these departments (such as chemistry, economics, etc.) assume major responsibility for the quality and content of instruction given within them. Hence it is now being provided that administrative heads of departments shall be autonomously elected for a three-year term, rather than appointed from above which was the former practice. And appropriate departmental action is now being instituted to consider initial appointments and all related matters including appraisal of teaching competence.

In order further to assure wise departmental leadership and the bringing in of distinguished additions to staff from outside, the presidents are charged most explicitly to study and report to us from time to time on the success of all departmental operations. Wherever in their opinion there is need of basic rejuvenation to enhance the quality of instruction, they too are charged to act affirmatively to correct such unfortunate situations within a department.

We have thus an organic and carefully triple-checked effort at the level of faculty action, of departmental action, and of administrative action, to assure wise choice of that staff which shall enjoy tenure, and to encourage the candid appraisal of the competence of individual teaching and of suitable rewards therefor, after tenure has been established.

An important and significant by-product of this changed procedure, it should be pointed out, is that it introduces a somewhat broader base of faculty representation and action all along the line in the control of the educational process. Nothing extreme has been done in this direction. But the changes do look to a somewhat more democratic method and personnel for determining matters of educational policy than has heretofore prevailed.

Indeed we believe these measures place us in the forefront of colleges where administration now becomes subject to reasonable check by the teachers themselves. Administrative responsibility has, of course, to be unified and clearly centralized for action. This we have preserved. But by all standards of wise democratic operation, it is also important to allow a sensible measure of conference, advance agreement, periodic review and explicit authorization by the electorate as a whole—in this case the members of our faculties.

These new by-laws thus represent a highly significant forward step in college government. We believe they will work to improve the quality of instruction and of personnel in our colleges. They also move in the direction of making college government more democratic within the bounds of administrative effectiveness—a direction long endorsed in the country-wide efforts of that solid and conservative group, the American Association of University Professors.

The people of New York City should now have more occasion than ever to be proud of the institutions of higher learning which they support.

BY-LAWS ON ORGANIZATION AND TENURE OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL STAFFS OF THE NEW YORK CITY COLLEGES

ARTICLE IV—ORGANIZATION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL STAFFS

SECTION 10

The instructional staff of the colleges shall be the presidents, deans, directors, professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, tutors, fellows, lecturers, librarians, associate librarians, and assistant librarians.

1. (a) The presidents shall have the affirmative responsibility of conserving and enhancing the educational standards of the colleges and schools under their jurisdiction. They shall be the expert advisers and chief executive agents of the Board; and as such shall have the immediate supervision, with full discretionary power in carrying into effect the by-laws, resolutions and policies of the Board, and the lawful resolutions of any of its committees or of the several faculties, and shall exercise general superintendence over the concerns, officers, employees and students of the educational institutions maintained by the Board. They shall attend meetings of the Board and advise on all matters related to educational policy and practice; they shall submit to the Board their independent recommendations and shall transmit promptly to the Board, directly or through its appropriate committees, all recommendations from the several faculties or faculty councils regarding curriculum, appointments, promotions and tentative annual budgets; and any other communications from faculties, officers, employees or students, together with any advice or recommendation of their own concerning the subject of such recommendations or communications. Between the meetings of the Board they are authorized in an emergency to fill temporary vacancies in the instructional staff below the rank of assistant professor in accordance with the method of appointment herein provided and to make such administrative arrangements and appointments as cannot well await the action of the Board or its appropriate committees; and they shall be responsible for assuring that the necessary departmental and administrative tentative annual budgets are initiated and submitted in the manner hereinafter provided. The presi-

dents shall have such additional specific duties as the Board shall designate.

(b) There shall be two classes of deans: academic deans and deans of students. Deans may be appointed by the Board to any college and to any school or division of a college. In making such appointments the Board shall have the advice of the presidents and the Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget.

Each academic dean shall be the executive officer of his faculty and shall carry into effect the by-laws and resolutions of the Board, the directions of the president and the appropriate resolutions of his faculty.

Each dean of students shall have supervision over such extra-curricular and disciplinary matters affecting students as may be assigned to him by the president or faculty.

(c) Directors may be appointed by the Board to supervise such divisions of the college as evening sessions, summer sessions, extension courses, or such bureaus or services as do not fall wholly within the field of action of any one faculty. In making such appointments the Board shall have the advice of the presidents. Staff appointments to the evening and summer sessions and to extension courses shall be made by the Board upon the recommendation of the president.

(d) Librarians may be appointed by the Board with the advice of the presidents. They shall be charged with the administration of the library facilities of their respective colleges.

(e) Other members of the instructional staff shall have such duties as are appropriate to the responsible discharge of their educational and administrative functions.

(f) Fellows shall be appointed annually with the maximum of a two-year assignment. Fellows shall be selected on a basis of their potentialities as scholars and teachers; in order to encourage advanced study, they shall be assigned a service load of not more than half the normal load for the functions which they perform.

2. (a) Organization of the Several Faculties. The faculty of each college, and where a college includes constituent schools, the faculty of each school, shall consist of the president, deans, directors, professors, associate professors, assistant professors and such instructors as have become members of the permanent staff, together with such other members of the staff as the faculty may add because of their educational responsibilities. All members

of the faculty shall have the right to vote except that instructors shall have the right to vote only after they have served two years on the permanent instructional staff of colleges or schools under the jurisdiction of the Board. All instructors who shall become members of the permanent instructional staff upon the adoption of this amendment to the by-laws and who have served five years as members of the instructional staff of any college or school under the jurisdiction of the Board shall be entitled to the right to vote as a member of the faculty.

In colleges where there are constituent schools, in addition to the several faculties, there shall be a Faculty Conference composed of the president, the deans, and three members of each of the several school faculties elected by the respective faculties or, where existent, by the Faculty Councils, from among the permanent members of the staff of professorial rank of the several schools. Of those elected by each school faculty the first year, one shall be elected for a term of one year, one for a term of two years and one for a term of three years. The terms of members elected thereafter shall be three years. It shall be the responsibility of the Faculty Conference to act as a co-ordinating body with respect to problems of administration, budget and educational policy as these affect the inter-relation of the several schools.

Where a college or school of a college has a faculty of less than one hundred, the voting members of the faculty shall consist of the president, deans, all members of professorial rank, and a number of instructors equal to fifty per cent of the members of professorial rank, to be elected for a term of three years by secret preferential ballot by the instructors who have been members of the permanent instructional staff for two years.

(b) *Duties of the Faculty.* The faculty shall meet at least once in each semester; or oftener upon call by its executive officers or by petition of ten per cent of its members. The faculty shall be responsible, subject to the requirements of the Board, for all matters pertaining to the formulation and administration of the curriculum, the granting of degrees, and the administration of student discipline. It shall make its own by-laws and conduct the educational affairs customarily cared for by a college faculty. The president shall preside at its meetings or in his absence the senior academic dean.

The faculty shall create such committees as it deems appropriate

to the effective exercise of its responsibilities but explicit provision shall be made for a Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget.

(c) Faculty Councils. In every college or school of a college in which the faculty shall exceed one hundred members, there shall be a Faculty Council. The Faculty Council shall consist of the president, deans, directors, and three delegates from each department where available. One such delegate shall be the department chairman. One shall be a member of professorial rank; and one shall be an instructor; each delegate shall be elected for a three-year term by secret ballot by the members of the faculty of his rank entitled to vote in each department.

The Council shall assume all the responsibilities of the faculty, subject only to the right of the faculty upon its own motion to review such action. A two-thirds vote of the faculty shall be required to overrule action of the Faculty Council.

(d) Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget. There shall be in each college or school a Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget. The chairman of this Committee shall be the president. The members of this Committee shall be the academic dean and the department chairman.

This Committee shall receive from the several departments all recommendations for appointments to the instructional staff, re-appointments thereto and promotions therein, together with compensation; it shall recommend action thereon to the president; its recommendations, together with the recommendations and comments of the president, shall be submitted promptly by him to the Board.

The president shall, within the period prescribed by the Board, prepare the annual tentative budget and submit it to the Committee for its recommendations; the Committee shall make its recommendations within the period prescribed by the Board; the president shall submit to the Board, within the period prescribed by it, such tentative annual budget together with his comments and recommendations. Upon failure of the Committee to act upon the budget within the period prescribed by the Board, the president shall submit to the Board his own recommendations, together with a statement of explanation.

The Committee shall receive and consider petitions and appeals from members of the instructional staff with respect to matters of status and compensation.

In colleges where there are constituent schools, the budget recommendations for the college and for the several schools shall be submitted to the Faculty Conference for review and after final approval by the Faculty Conference, it shall be submitted to the Board by the president together with his own comments and recommendations.

3. Department Organization. Each department, subject to the approval of the faculty, or Faculty Council where existent, shall have control of the educational policies of the Department through the vote of all of its members who are members of the Faculty.

The executive officer of the department shall be the department chairman who shall be a person of professorial rank, elected by secret ballot for a term of three years, by the members of the instructional staff of the department who are members of the faculty. Such election shall be subject to the approval of the Board.

There shall be in each department a Committee on Appointments, elected every three years, consisting of the department chairman as chairman and equal representation from each available instructional rank included in the faculty.

Each department may name such other committees as it chooses and shall have the fullest measure of autonomy consistent with the maintenance of general college educational policy.

The chairman shall be responsible for the execution of departmental policies and the execution of faculty and Board policies within the department. He shall represent the department before the Faculty Council, the faculty and the Board. He shall preside at meetings of his department. He shall prepare the tentative departmental budget which shall be subject to approval by the department's Committee on Appointments, after which it shall be submitted to the president.

Each college library shall constitute an instructional department of which the librarian shall be chairman. This department shall include also associate librarians and assistant librarians, and the chairman of the faculty Library Committee which shall be elected by the faculty.

4. Appointments. Original appointments of professorial rank shall be initiated (1) by the department, in the manner outlined for other original appointments; or (2) by the president, pursuant to his responsibility for conserving and enhancing the educational standards of the colleges and schools under his jurisdiction. The

president may recommend that such appointee be designated as a department chairman. Before recommending such original appointment or designation, the president shall confer with members of the department and shall thereafter submit his recommendations to the Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget.

All other original appointments, all reappointments and appointments to the permanent instructional staff of a department shall be recommended to the Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget by the chairman of the department, after a majority vote of the members of the department's Committee on Appointments.

In cases where the Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget does not approve a recommendation concerning an appointment, said Committee shall report such action with its reasons, together with the recommendations of the department, to the president. The president shall transmit to the Board with his own recommendations and comments all reports from the department and from the Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget.

After original appointments are made, the chairman of the department shall be charged with the responsibility for assuring careful observation and guidance of those members of the instructional staff of the department who are on temporary appointment. The chairman of the department, when recommending such temporary appointees for permanent appointment shall make full report to the Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget regarding the appointees' teacher qualifications and classroom work, the relationships of said appointees with their students and colleagues, and their professional and creative work.

5. Promotions. Promotions from the rank of instructor to that of assistant professor shall be recommended to the Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget by the Chairman of the Department only after a majority affirmative vote of all the members of professorial rank in the department. Promotions to the rank of associate professor shall be so recommended only after a majority affirmative vote of all the associate professors and professors of the department. Promotion to the rank of professor shall be recommended by the Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget. In departments where every professorial rank is not represented in the membership of the department, however, recommendations for promotion shall be initiated by the Committee on

Appointments of the department, except in the case of promotion to a professorship.

Special salary increments may be recommended to the Board by the Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget.

6. **New Colleges.** The provisions of this by-law, insofar as they specify certain organizational duties and responsibilities of the instructional staff, shall not apply to newly-created colleges until three years after their establishment. However, insofar as practicable, the spirit of this by-law shall be observed in the organization and operation of the departments of such college.

7. **Repeal Clause.** All existing by-laws and resolutions of the Board or portions thereof inconsistent with the provisions of this by-law are hereby repealed and annulled.

8. **Effective Date.** This by-law shall become effective November 1, 1938.

ARTICLE IX—TENURE OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

I. 1. All members of the permanent instructional staffs of the colleges, high schools, model schools and other schools under the jurisdiction of the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York shall have tenure of office.

2. Tenure of office means that those persons entitled to it shall hold their positions during good behavior and efficient and competent service and shall not be removed save by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the Board, for cause, after due notice and hearing as hereinafter provided.

3. **Permanent Instructional Staff Defined.** (a) The permanent instructional staff shall consist of all persons employed on an annual salary basis in the day sessions of the colleges, high schools, model schools and other schools under the jurisdiction of the Board in the grades of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, tutor, librarian, associate librarian, assistant librarian, assistant teacher, instructor, critic teacher, or teacher, who, at the time this by-law becomes effective, are serving on the instructional staff and have completed at least four full years of continuous service on an annual salary from the date of their appointment to the instructional staff or who have so served at least three full years and have been appointed for a fourth full year.

(b) All such persons now in the instructional staffs who by June 30, 1938, or thereafter shall have completed three years of

continuous service on an annual salary from the date of their appointment in any of the ranks enumerated in (a) above and who may be appointed for a fourth full year shall become members of the permanent instructional staff, beginning September 1 of that year.

(c) All persons who may be appointed hereafter to any of the ranks enumerated in (a) above and who, after serving on an annual salary three full years continuously, may be appointed for a fourth year in the manner hereinafter provided shall become members of the permanent instructional staffs on September 1 following their reappointment for the fourth full year. In the case of persons appointed initially to professorial rank, permanent instructional status may be granted by the Board after one year of satisfactory service. In the case of tutors, appointment for a fourth full year shall be made only after they have met the eligibility requirements for the instructorship as set forth in these by-laws and shall carry with it promotion to the rank of instructor. If such tutors have not met such eligibility requirements for the instructorship they may be continued on the temporary instructional staff until they have met the said requirements of eligibility for appointment to the permanent staff, but in no case shall such additional service on the temporary staff exceed two years.

(d) The temporary instructional staff shall consist of all persons referred to in (a) above, until they become members of the permanent instructional staff.

(e) Nothing herein contained shall be construed to confer tenure upon presidents, deans, directors, principals of high or model schools, heads of departments, or first assistants (supervisors). But appointment to such administrative offices or the loss of same shall not deprive such persons of tenure in the highest instructional grades in which they have served prior to or during their appointment to such office. All persons now serving in, or who may be hereafter appointed to, the office of president, dean, director or principal, if not already named to one of the protected grades in the instructional staff, may be appointed to an appropriate instructional grade. Nothing herein contained shall prevent the Board, when making appointments to the offices of president, dean, director or principal of persons not at the time members of the instructional staffs of the colleges under the juris-

diction of the Board from making such appointments for a fixed period not to exceed three years.

4. Appointments to the Temporary Staff. (a) All original appointments to the temporary instructional staffs in the rank of professor or below, shall be made for one year or less. The service of any person appointed on an annual basis may be discontinued at the end of the first year or if reappointed, at the end of the second or third year. Where services are to be discontinued at the end of the first or second year, notice in writing shall be given to the appointee by the president of the college of the intention of the proper faculty authority not to recommend such person for reappointment by March 15 preceding expiration of the term of appointment; where services are to be discontinued at the end of the third year, such notice shall be given by March 1 preceding the expiration of the term of appointment.

5. Appointments to the Permanent Staff. (a) If before the expiration of the third full year of service, the appropriate departmental authority is satisfied that such person is competent to be appointed to the permanent staff, and in accordance with the procedure set forth in these by-laws the Board appoints such person to the permanent staff, the decision of the Board shall be communicated to the person affected not later than March 1 preceding the expiration of the third full year of service. The tenure period shall run from September 1 of each year for all appointees. Where appointees begin their service prior to September 1 the tenure period shall not begin until the succeeding September 1. Where appointments are made during the month of September, the appointment shall date as of September 1 for purposes of tenure.

(b) The Administrator of the Board shall notify all persons who are entitled to tenure under Article IX, Sec. 1-3 (a) of these by-laws as soon as practicable. In the case of all other persons the said Administrator as soon as practicable thereafter, shall address a communication to such persons informing them of their status and enclosing a copy of this by-law. Thereafter, immediately upon the appointment of any person to the permanent instructional staffs of the colleges and schools under the jurisdiction of the Board, the Administrator of the Board shall send a notice in writing to such person notifying him or her of such appointment to the permanent staff.

(c) The Board may admit to membership in the permanent instructional staff persons employed at the time of the adoption of this by-law on other than an annual salary basis or as lecturers on an annual salary basis, who have fulfilled the function of full time members of the instructional staff and who in the spirit of these by-laws should be accorded the right of tenure which would attach to such position.

(d) If such persons have not completed three full years of such service at the time of the adoption of this by-law, they may be admitted to membership in the permanent instructional staff upon the completion of three continuous years of such services and the appointment to a fourth full year.

6. (a) Transfer of a person from the instructional staff of any department or school to the instructional staff of another department or school under the jurisdiction of the Board, or promotion from one rank to another, shall not interrupt the period requisite to appointment to the permanent staff.

(b) Transfer of a person on the permanent staff from one department or school to the instructional staff of another department or school under the jurisdiction of the Board, or promotion from one rank to another, shall not deprive such person of tenure.

(c) Nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the Board from assigning any person having permanent tenure to any appropriate position on the staff, but no such assignment shall carry with it a reduction in rank or a reduction in salary other than the elimination of any additional emolument provided for administrative positions.

(d) Nothing herein contained shall be construed as preventing the Board from discontinuing any position occupied by a person enjoying tenure and if the Board can find no assignment which can be efficiently and capably filled by said member of the permanent staff in the college, high school or model school in which he serves, then his name shall be placed, for a period of three years, on an eligible list of candidates for appointment to a vacancy that then exists or may thereafter occur in such college, high school or model school in a position similar to the one which such person filled or in any other position which can be capably and efficiently filled by such person. Such reappointment shall be at the last salary received by such person.

A member of the permanent staff whose name is placed on the eligible list shall be granted a leave of absence without pay or increment credit during the time he is on such eligible list.

(e) The Board may by resolution prescribe physical standards and examinations as a prerequisite for appointment to the temporary and permanent instructional staff.

II. Charges, Trials, Removals, Suspensions.

1. Persons having tenure may be removed or suspended from the permanent staff for one or more of the following reasons:

(a) incompetent or inefficient service.

(b) neglect of duty.

(c) physical or mental incapacity.

(d) conduct unbecoming a member of the staff. This provision shall not be so interpreted as to constitute interference with academic freedom.

2. Charges against a member of the permanent staff may be made by a president, dean, director, department head, principal, or member of the Board. Charges shall in the first instance be presented to the president or principal. It shall be the duty of the president or principal upon making or receiving such charges to submit them with all supporting evidence to a committee on faculty personnel. Such committee shall make such investigation of such charges as in its judgment may be warranted and file its report with all supporting evidence with the president or principal, who shall forward formal charges and specifications to the Board together with his own and the committee's recommendations. If the committee or the president recommends a trial by the Board upon such charges, then the Board shall proceed in the manner hereinafter set forth. If the committee and the president or either of them report against further investigation or trial of such charges, their action shall be final unless the Board by resolution decides to proceed with such charges upon its own authority.

3. Service. Upon receipt of charges by the Board and the recommendation of the faculty committee and the president for a trial of the same, it shall be the duty of the Administrator of the Board to make service upon the person accused in the charges. Such service shall be made in the following manner:

(a) By personal delivery of a copy of the charges and specifications to the accused by a person qualified to serve a summons on an action at law in the State of New York, or,

(b) If personal delivery cannot be made with reasonable diligence, by registered mail or by leaving a copy of the charges and specifications at the place of residence of the accused person with some person of an age of discretion and by notifying such person of the nature of the papers and by leaving a duplicate of such charges and specifications at the college or school where such person is assigned with some person of discretion at the place where such accused is accustomed to report for duty, or

(c) If service cannot with reasonable diligence be made, as provided under (a) or (b) above, by posting a copy of the charges and specifications upon the bulletin board of the college or school and of the department to which the accused is assigned. The charges and specifications shall be accompanied by a notice which shall contain the place, the date, and the hour for which the hearing is fixed. An affidavit by the person who has served such charges and specifications or by the person who has posted such charges in the manner prescribed above shall be presumptive proof of the facts therein set forth.

(d) Service of charges and specifications shall not be effected between June 1 and September 1 nor during leave of absence.

4. The person accused shall have ten days from the date of such service of charges in which to file an answer in writing with the Board. The Chairman of the Board, on written application filed with him, may grant an extension of ten days for the filing of an answer.

5. Upon receipt of such answer or upon default of the person accused to file such answer, the Board shall fix a date for the trial and the accused shall be given at least ten days' notice of such trial by delivery or posting in the manner set forth in 3 (a), (b), and (c), for service of charges.

6. Trial. The Board shall upon the filing of such charges elect a committee of not less than three members to conduct a trial of the charges.

Such committee shall conduct the trial according to such rules as the Board may from time to time establish for the conduct of such trials. The rules of the Board or in their absence those employed by the Committee shall govern the trial and the Committee shall not be bound by the rules of evidence observed in courts of law.

The accused shall be entitled to representation during his trial by any person of his choice. The accused shall be confronted with the witnesses against him, shall be privileged to be present at all sessions of the trial committee when testimony is being heard, shall have the right to examine and cross-examine witnesses and to produce witnesses and relevant documents.

7. The trial committee shall, on the conclusion of the trial, without unnecessary delay, make a report to the Board together with its recommendations and shall file with its report and recommendations a transcript of the testimony which shall be delivered to each member of the Board. The Board, not later than two months after the presentation of the report by the trial committee shall render its judgment upon said charges and shall fix the penalty if the decision is against the accused. Such penalty may consist of reprimand, suspension with or without pay or dismissal.

8. Suspension. Pending his trial, any person against whom charges have been made may be suspended by the president of the college, with the concurrence of the department head. Such concurrence shall not be required for the suspension of a chairman of department or administrative officer.

Where the president exercises the power of suspension he shall transmit to the Board without delay and without the submission of formal charges to the Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget, all the charges and supporting evidence together with his reasons for making such suspension. The president shall immediately notify the accused person in writing of such suspension. Persons so suspended shall have the privilege at their own option and request of having the charges submitted without delay to the Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget for its consideration, in which case the procedure shall be as in cases of charges and trials without suspension. Where the decision of the Board shall exonerate the accused person, he shall be entitled to receive the salary of which he was deprived during the period of suspension.

III. Repeal Clause.

All existing by-laws and resolutions of the Board or portions thereof inconsistent with the provisions of this by-law are hereby repealed and annulled.

IV. Effective Date.

This by-law shall become effective September 1, 1938.

AMONG THE COLLEGES

DUKE UNIVERSITY'S centennial celebration began with a "Symposium of Medical Problems" on October 13-15. Other symposia, which will take place in November, December and March, will be devoted to "The New Economic Base of the South," "The Law and Modern Society," and "Women and Contemporary Civilization." The formal celebration of the centennial will be held April 21-23, 1939.

GREENSBORO COLLEGE observed its centennial May 13-23. Addresses were given by President Marion Edwards Park, of Bryn Mawr College; President William Preston Few, of Duke University; and Dean Lynn Harold Hough, of Drew University.

GOUCHER COLLEGE is celebrating its semi-centennial this year. The principal ceremonies were conducted on October 14-16. Included among the speakers on the first day's program were Dr. Mildred McAfee, president of Wellesley College, Dr. Isaiah Bowman, president of Johns Hopkins University, and Dr. David Allan Robertson, president of Goucher College. A panel discussion on the aims of higher education was scheduled for the second day.

UTAH STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE observed the fiftieth anniversary of its founding in June. Speakers at the ceremonies included Dr. John A. Widtsoe, Elder Stephen L. Richards, Dr. Paul Popenoe, Dr. Phil M. Buck, Jr., and President Robert Gordon Sproul, of the University of California.

AT KENT STATE UNIVERSITY of Ohio, Dr. Karl Clayton Leebrick was inaugurated as president on October 21, 1938.

MOUNT UNION COLLEGE'S fifth president, Dr. Charles Burgess Ketcham, was formally inducted on October 20, 1938. A symposium on current educational problems was scheduled for the afternoon. President John L. Seaton of the Association gave an address on "The Obligations of the Church-Related College to the Past."

DR. EARL HARPER, formerly president of Simpson College, is now the director of the School of Fine Arts, Iowa State University.

DR. HARRY L. UPPERMAN, who was elected chancellor of Nebraska Wesleyan University in March, 1938, has resigned to assume again the presidency of Baxter Seminary. His return was made at the urgent request of persons interested in Baxter, where he has been president for fifteen years.

BATTLE CREEK COLLEGE has been forced to close its doors this fall because of a lack of funds sufficient to carry on its educational work.

AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY work has commenced on the new \$1,150,000 building which will house the College of Business Administration on the new campus along the Charles River. A gift of \$486,500 from the Charles Hayden Foundation for the new building was announced at the commencement exercises.

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY has received a gift of \$100,000, which completes the amount required for two additional wings to the Engineering Building. Construction of these additions is scheduled to start this fall.

AT COLBY COLLEGE Dr. James R. Angell was the principal speaker on the occasion which marked the beginning of the work on the new college buildings. These are being erected on a tract of six hundred acres acquired by the college in 1931.

MANHATTAN COLLEGE observed the seventy-fifth anniversary of the reception of its charter from the University of the State of New York with appropriate ceremonies on April 26. The dedication of the Cardinal Hayes Library, erected to commemorate the late Cardinal Hayes, was the most important feature of the celebration.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY is establishing, in its Division of General Education, a national center for safety education,

planned primarily for the instruction of teachers. The project, the first of its kind in the United States, has been set up under a special grant of funds from the National Conservation Bureau to provide a comprehensive program of instruction, research and information in problems of accident control. Eighteen research fellowships in safety education, with stipends ranging from \$400 to \$1,200, have been offered to public school teachers, supervisors, administrators and instructors in institutions for the training of teachers. Dr. Herbert J. Stack, formerly director of the education division of the National Conservation Bureau, is the director of the new safety education center.

THE UNIVERSITY OF DENVER, aided by a grant of \$29,000 from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, has been enabled to offer courses providing training for a new profession, that of appraiser of the efficiency of city and county governments. Ten fellowships, ranging from \$900 to \$1,800 a year, have been offered to graduates of colleges and universities. Students, who will participate in both technical courses and field work, will be prepared to serve as research aids to citizen groups now being formed in many parts of the country to evaluate the local government, to check waste and to improve welfare services.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO announced that a conditional grant of \$1,500,000 was made them by the Rockefeller Foundation for endowment of research in the biological sciences. To obtain the grant the university must secure an additional sum of \$500,000 before June 30, 1941. During the next three years the foundation will provide a total of \$180,000, at the rate of not more than \$60,000 a year. A gift of \$50,000 to the Graduate Library School by the Carnegie Corporation brings to more than \$1,500,000 the contributions of the Carnegie Corporation to the school, which they helped to establish ten years ago. Six research projects in library problems will be undertaken with the new funds.

WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY dedicated its new \$100,000 library on May 7. The building has seating capacity for approximately three hundred students, while facilities can ultimately be enlarged to take care of 75,000 volumes.

THE VERY REVEREND WALTER B. MATTHEWS, dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, is giving the William Belden Noble lectures at Harvard University this winter. He is also lecturing at various seminaries and universities while he is in this country.

THE UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE will erect a \$410,000 administration building made possible by a gift of \$200,000, the amount needed to secure a P.W.A. grant covering the remainder of the cost of the building. The donor, Mr. H. Fletcher Brown, recently gave the university a new chemistry building costing approximately \$400,000.

TRAINING IN PUBLIC SERVICE is being provided by the state of Wisconsin for selected students from educational institutions. The apprenticeships, which are for a period of one year with possibility of renewal, involve assignment to work in one of the state departments as attorney, accountant, engineer, research economist, etc., for which remuneration at the rate of \$125 per month is paid. Students devote three and one-half working hours a week for ten months of their first year to a series of lectures and discussions on administration presented by experts from all the state departments. After completion of their apprenticeships those interested in permanent service may take examinations for available positions.

THE LEAGUE FOR POLITICAL EDUCATION, which has been presenting the popular radio program, America's Town Meeting of the Air, was organized in order to encourage people to become familiar with national and international problems. They have prepared printed helps for individuals and groups who are interested in studying or discussing these public questions. They also have made available suggestions for the formation of discussion groups and forums. The address of the League for Political Education is Town Hall, 123 West Forty-third Street, New York City.

NEW COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Bessie Tift College, Forsyth, Georgia. C. L. McGinty, professor, Baptist Woman's Missionary Union Training School, Louisville, Kentucky.

Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham, Alabama. R. R. Paty, director, Julius Rosenwald Fund.

Central State Teachers College, Stevens Point, Wisconsin. Philip H. Falk, superintendent of schools, Waukesha, Wisconsin.

Centre College of Kentucky, Danville, Kentucky. Robert L. McLeod, Jr., Presbyterian Board of Missions, Philadelphia.

Dominican College, New Orleans, Louisiana. Sister Mary Vincent Killeen, dean, Dominican College.

H. Sophie Newcomb College, New Orleans, Louisiana. Frederick Hard (dean), professor, Tulane University.

Hamilton College, Clinton, New York. W. H. Cowley, professor and research associate, Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University.

Huntingdon College, Montgomery, Alabama. Hubert Searey, professor, Birmingham-Southern College.

Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant, Iowa. Stanley B. Niles, district superintendent, Methodist Episcopal Church, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Michigan. Paul Lamont Thompson, president, Shurtleff College.

Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina, Kansas. Edgar K. Morrow, auditor and business manager, Kansas Wesleyan University.

Linfield College, McMinnville, Oregon. William G. Everson, pastor, White Temple Baptist Church, Portland, Oregon.

Loyola College, Baltimore, Maryland. Edward B. Bunn, professor, Fordham University.

Millsaps College, Jackson, Mississippi. M. L. Smith, professor, Birmingham-Southern College.

Missouri Valley College, Marshall, Missouri. Thomas W. Bibb, president, Albany College.

Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln, Nebraska. Benjamin Franklin Schwartz, pastor, Methodist Episcopal Church, Indianola, Iowa.

North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo, North Dakota. Frank L. Eversull, president, Huron College.

Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio. Edward L. Rice (acting), professor, Ohio Wesleyan University.

Parsons College, Fairfield, Iowa. Donald L. Hibbard, Equitable Life Assurance Society.

Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma. Eugene S. Briggs, president, Christian College.

Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa. John O. Gross, president, Union College, Kentucky.

Spring Hill College, Spring Hill, Alabama. W. D. O'Leary.

State Teachers College, Minot, North Dakota. C. C. Swain, president, State Teachers College, Mayville, North Dakota.

University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tennessee. Archie M. Palmer, executive secretary of Cornellian Council, Cornell University.

University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska. C. S. Boucher, president, West Virginia University.

Upsala College, East Orange, New Jersey. Evald B. Lawson, pastor, Trinity Lutheran Church, White Plains, New York.

ADDITIONS TO THE OFFICE LIBRARY

- ABSTRACTS OF DISSERTATIONS PRESENTED BY CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY. Summer Quarter 1937. The Ohio State University, Columbus. 1938. 489 p.
- BADEN, ALLAN P. *The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education*, development and scope of the ratio studiorum. The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee. 1938. 478 p.
- BELL, HOWARD M. *Youth Tell Their Story*. A study of the conditions and attitudes of young people in Maryland between the ages of 16 and 24. Conducted for the American Youth Commission. American Council on Education, Washington. 1938. 273 p. \$1.50.
- COLEMAN, ALGERNON. *An Analytical Bibliography of Modern Language Teaching, 1932-1937*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 1938. 561 p. \$4.50.
- HARLOW, REX F. *The Daily Newspaper and Higher Education*. Stanford University Press, Stanford University. 1938. 44 p. \$1.00.
- HARTOG, SIR PHILIP AND GLADYS ROBERTS. *A Conspectus of Examinations in Great Britain and Northern Ireland*. Macmillan and Company, London. 1937. 182 p.
- HOLLIS, ERNEST VICTOR. *Philanthropic Foundations and Higher Education*. Columbia University Press, New York. 1938. 365 p. \$3.50.
- THE INAUGURATION OF OLIVER C. CARMICHAEL AS CHANCELLOR OF VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY and a Symposium on Higher Education in the South. Vanderbilt University, Nashville. 1938. 289 p.
- KLEITMAN, N., F. J. MULLIN, N. R. COOPERMAN AND S. TITELBAUM. *Sleep Characteristics*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 1937. 87 p.
- MENEFEE, LOUISE ARNOLD AND M. M. CHAMBERS. *American Youth, An Annotated Bibliography*. The American Council on Education, Washington. 1938. 493 p. \$3.00.
- MOOR, ARTHUR PRICHARD. *The Library-Museum of Music and Dance*. Contributions to Education, No. 750. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. 1938. 186 p.
- PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION ORGANIZATIONS. A Directory 1938-39. Public Administration Clearing House, Chicago. 1938. 184 p.
- UNITED STATES. Department of Interior, Office of Education. Washington. *Education in the Southern Mountains*. H. W. Gaumnitz and Katherine M. Cook. Bulletin 1937, No. 26. 1938. 51 p.
- Guidance Bibliography*, compiled by Marion H. Witmer and Maris M. Proffitt. Bulletin 1937, No. 37. 1938. 72 p. 10c.
- Needed Research in Secondary Education*. Carl A. Jessen. Bulletin 1937, No. 28. 1938. 69 p. 10c.
- Opportunities for the Preparation of Teachers of Exceptional Children*. Elsie H. Martens. Bulletin 1937, No. 17. 1938. 58 p. 10c.
- Per Capita Costs in City Schools, 1936-37*. Lula Mae Comstock. Pamphlet No. 81. 1938. 24 p. 5c.
- WILSON, LOUIS R. *The Geography of Reading*. American Library Association and the University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 1938. 481 p.